DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 561 SP 004 443

TITLE	Conference on Teacher Certification; Current Problems in Certification and Prospects for Reciprocity (2nd, Montreal, June 8-9, 1970).
INSTITUTION	Canadian Teachers' Federation, Ottawa (Ontario).
PUB DATE	Sep 70
NOTE	77p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.95
DESCRIPTORS	*Coordination, Interstate Programs, Standards, *Teacher Certification
IDENTIFIERS	*Canada

ABSTRACT

This report contains the proceedings of a 2-day interprovincial conference attended by 38 teachers, registrars, university professors, and trustees to discuss means of reducing the complexity of teacher certification regulations and of enabling teachers to move more freely among the various provinces. Included are four presentations on the functional approach to teacher certification including discussion of quantity and quality of teachers, salary classification, and teaching assignments; four presentations and a plenary discussion of the road to reciprocity including first steps, feasibility and desirability, and uniformity in certification in the Atlantic provinces; and group reports, discussion, and recommendations. Appendixes contain the program, a list of participants, and the resolutions adopted in which it was agreed that a degree plus a year of training was the minimum level at which reciprocity could be instituted, that attempts should be made to standardize application forms and document requirements, and that a clearinghouse of information should be established at Canadian Teachers' Federation (CTF) through which teachers could obtain information regarding the requirements and procedures of other provinces. (JS)

ED045561

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

C-70403

SECOND CONFERENCE ON TEACHER CERTIFICATION

Current Problems in Certification and Prospects for Reciprocity

Proceedings of the Meeting
Held at
The Holiday Inn
Montreal, Quebec
June 8-9, 1970

Canadian Teachers' Federation
320 Queen Street Ottawa 4, Ontario
September 1970

SP004443

P R E F A C E

The Canadian Teachers' Federation, almost since its founding in 1920, has sought some means of reducing the complexity of certification regulations and of enabling teachers to move more freely among the various provinces. In pursuit of these ideals, the Federation has published various informational documents and adopted various policy statements. In 1968, for the first time, it convened an interprovincial meeting of teachers, registrars, university professors and trustees to discuss certification. This meeting, it was felt, was quite disappointing. While a number of the problems in certification were brought forward, no enthusiasm seemed to be directed toward finding solutions. The only action following the meeting was the publication of the proceedings.

Early in 1970, however, new interest arose in questions of certification as a result of several changes in the educational world. Among these changes were the observed shift in the teacher supply situation, the institution of qualification evaluation services in a number of the provinces and the steps toward reciprocity of certificates that were being taken in the Atlantic provinces. On the basis of these changes it was agreed that there might be merit in CTF sponsoring a second interprovincial conference in this area.

The CTF Teacher Education and Certification Committee was of the opinion that there would be little point in holding another conference unless every effort were made to achieve at least some small advance toward the goal of reciprocal recognition of certificates. Accordingly, a working paper was written and sent in advance to conference participants. This working paper, which attempted to sort out the many strands of the complex certification situation, is being published separately under the title Teacher Certification in Canada -- A Functional Approach. As well, a questionnaire was circulated to the participants, seeking their opinion on various matters, including the necessity, desirability and possibility of achieving reciprocity. Of the 38 delegates, 23 returned questionnaires. Of those replying, 21 thought that reciprocity in certification was necessary, desirable or possible. Sixteen thought it was desirable, sixteen possible and eleven thought it necessary. Two people thought it was unnecessary, one thought it undesirable and one thought it impossible.

In general, then, delegates brought to the conference some commitment to the idea of reciprocity. This attitude is reflected in the resolutions which received approval from a majority of those present and which are summarized in Appendix 3 of this report. In general, it was agreed that a degree plus a year of training was the minimum level at which reciprocity could be instituted. It was also

agreed that attempts should be made to standardize application forms and document requirements and to establish a clearinghouse of information at CTF through which teachers could obtain information regarding the requirements and procedures of other provinces.

While some of these steps toward reciprocity seem very small, they are nevertheless longer than any which have been taken hitherto and constitute some basis on which to rest a continuing series of interprovincial meetings on teacher certification.

Geraldine Channon,
Executive Assistant,
Canadian Teachers' Federation

C O N T E N T S

THE FUNCTIONAL APPROACH TO TEACHER CERTIFICATION

MURPHY, MARTIN. Introduction..... 1

CHANNON, GERALDINE. Quantity and Quality of Teachers..... 3

RIEGER, TOM. Salary Classification..... 5

MOSHER, RUSSELL. Teaching Assignments..... 8

THE ROAD TO RECIPROCITY

CHANNON, GERALDINE. Some First Steps Toward Reciprocity.... 11

EATON, DAVID M. Response re Feasibility..... 18

COUCH, E. A. The Feasibility and Desirability of Reciprocity..... 20

ADAMS, R. D. Uniformity in Teacher Certification in the Atlantic Provinces..... 25

PLENARY DISCUSSION..... 29

GROUP REPORTS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 37

APPENDICES

1. The Program..... 67

2. List of Persons Attending..... 71

3. Recommendations of the Meeting..... 75

THE FUNCTIONAL APPROACH TO TEACHER CERTIFICATION

INTRODUCTION

MARTIN MURPHY, Chairman
CTF Teacher Education and
Certification Committee

In March 1968, the Canadian Teachers' Federation convened a meeting on the certification of teachers which was attended by representatives of the ministries of education, the universities, and the teaching profession. At that time the functions and definitions of certification were discussed, as were the question of who should control teacher education and certification, the problems of reciprocity of teaching certificates as seen by a certificating authority and the reciprocal recognition of teaching certificates as seen by a teachers' association.

Suggestions arose from groups regarding the steps that might be taken towards realizing some of our ambitions. And now, two years later, we are meeting again on "The Functional Approach to Teacher Certification." This is great. These meetings should be even more frequent, probably annual. Perhaps some delegates to the 1968 conference were a little pessimistic at that time over all the platitudes, where there seemed to be little promise of action, but we must remember that the ten educational jurisdictions in Canada are completely autonomous, that even when agreements on a principle are reached, the actual implementation and the thrust for change must come from within each of the several provinces.

Happily, we can report that there is evidence of considerable progress. Many of the suggestions advanced in 1968 have since been implemented. I might say that CTF deserves credit for having taken the initiative in this direction. Teachers are collaborating in areas heretofore sacrosanct to the departments of education. CTF has encouraged our provincial members to form teacher education and certification committees. Teachers are now demanding consultation and participation.

In fairness, I must admit that teachers have been traditionally reluctant to become very involved in this area, perhaps because of a lack of knowledge of the role that they could play in the teacher education and certification function, but also perhaps because of discouragement or despair, the feeling that the department of education will do what it wants to anyway. Teachers so often have a

feeling that any consultation is purely a formality, in some instances a mockery. But thankfully things are changing and teachers are enjoying a more receptive climate. Indeed, the fact that every provincial registrar in the nation is represented here today is clear evidence of that.

Other achievements recently include the shared responsibility for the development of certification and teacher education programs, as well as the acceptance by teachers' organizations of some responsibility for judging teacher competence. Now teacher competence is one area that we do not intend to deal with at this conference because it is so complex, and we agree that we would need a separate conference for that one item. Since our last meeting progress has also been made regarding the minimizing of the number of special certificates which are being issued.

Now I see it as my responsibility to outline some of the major areas of our concern and I have put these in the form of questions.

1. To what extent has certification acted to set high standards for entrance to the teaching profession?

2. Has the public been protected from unqualified practitioners?

3. Are emergency programs any longer necessary with the advent of a surplus of teachers? With this possibility imminent, can we not all agree on the minimum standards?

   The CTF policy is that all teachers must have professional training and in addition should hold a university degree or an acceptable equivalent.

4. The question is, where should these teachers be educated? We all agree that they should be educated in a university milieu. Has the time not come for a joint accreditation of preparation programs which will be nationally recognized?

5. The policy is to urge upon every provincial authority the reciprocal recognition of teacher certificates between provinces. Is there justification for the multiplicity of certificates? Can teaching certificates in our very mobile age <u>not</u> be equated across Canada? What difficulties stand in the way?

6. Do school boards or principals arbitrarily assign teachers, one body per classroom, without regard for the teacher's interest, talent or specialization?

7. What should be the status of our profession? We mention the desire for a highly qualified, mobile teaching staff. Must the migrant therefore continue to take school law, or philosophy of education, or whatever is required? Will this course make him qualified?

8. In this period of inflation and high costs, can we not economize with the red tape? Surely we can agree on the person in each province that a teacher may contact to get a just and honest and official answer to any of his questions, before migrating.

It is our hope that we will have an annual meeting to build upon what we accomplish today and tomorrow. Is it not opportune, now that we are in Quebec, to show Canada that there is such a word as "agree"? I hope that the evidence on the areas of reciprocity will not only be recorded in a beautifully bound volume but I shall look forward to receiving, along with the recommendations tomorrow, a commitment for action.

QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF TEACHERS

GERALDINE CHANNON
Executive Assistant
Canadian Teachers' Federation

The working paper which was given to you before the conference attempts to draw together various strands of change in education and relate them to certification and associated processes. This morning my task is to give further emphasis to developments relating to the quantity and quality of teachers, to pose questions and to suggest some implications for the policies of teachers' associations and other bodies.

The principal fact we have to come to grips with is that the context of teacher certification has changed very greatly in a rather short time. Up until about three years ago we kept on assuming, despite growing evidence to the contrary, that we were going to continue operating in a situation with the following characteristics:

1. Ever-increasing enrolments in lower elementary grades along with increased retention throughout the school system.

2. A shortage of teachers which, while less acute, would still be sufficient to prevent any rapid raising of qualification standards.

3. A growing economy which could readily bear and would not resist increases in educational expenditures.

4. Maintenance of many smaller districts and schools in which very little specialization or differentiation by function would be possible. This is the school with just four types of staff positions -- principal, teacher, secretary and janitor.

Now, however, we have realized that we are operating with a quite new set of variables which seem to be precisely the reverse of those I have just enumerated and with which we have been long familiar:

1. Enrolments are stabilizing.

2. Heavy resistance to increased taxation is appearing, coupled with reduced economic growth.

3. Teacher shortages, in general at least, are disappearing, and surpluses are appearing instead.

4. District and school consolidation has proceeded at a rapid pace, with the resultant increases in specialization and differentiation of task. Some school districts now employ personnel in as many as a hundred or more differently named and defined positions.

All of these developments are exerting pressures on education generally and, of course, on the functions which are very much related to certification. What are the results likely to be? It seems to me, in speculating on the direction of trends, that one may see the following:

1. The raising of the minimum requirement for entrance to teaching to degree status by 1975.

2. School boards balancing off their demand for higher-priced professional teachers against their demand for less expensive paraprofessionals.

3. Pressure to recognize, through certification or otherwise, special teacher training above degree level.

4. Pressure to define the roles and responsibilities of paraprofessionals and to issue them certificates.

These kinds of developments suggest a fairly pressing need for the development of definitions. In particular, it is going to become important to define rather closely the term teacher and to indicate what teaching is. Also needed, I think, will be definitions of specialist positions in education which require post-graduate training and, probably, definitions of the training needed by members of related professions who work in schools -- i.e., librarians, social workers and psychologists.

There are a whole host of problems involved here which you may wish to go into in your discussion groups. I won't try to go into them any further here, except to suggest some items on which it might in the near future be found desirable to establish new or revised policy. They may be best expressed in the form of questions.

1. Should teacher associations adopt and push for a definite timetable for raising the minimum requirement for entering teaching to degree level?

2. Should committees representing government, teachers and others be undertaking joint long-range studies of manpower needs in the schools?

3. Should teacher associations take into membership on some basis paraprofessionals such as teacher aides and educational resource technicians?

4. Should teacher associations take into membership school personnel trained in other professions, such as social workers and librarians?

5. Should legal differentiation of professional and paraprofessional tasks be sought?

6. Is there a need to move towards greater professional autonomy through such measures as the establishment of provincial registries of teachers?

SAIARY CLASSIFICATION

TOM RIEGER
Executive Assistant
The Alberta Teachers' Association

In introducing the topic of classification for placement on salary scales, I have some assumptions or premises as a starting-point and one of these is that the essential function of certification is the granting of a licence or conferring of a legal right to teach. Miss Channon's paper points out that since education of children up to a certain age is the responsibility of provincial governments, and is compulsory, it is also the function of governments to see that qualified people are placed as teachers and hence the need for some licence. That's the first point, and I think that's the essential point, in certification. And while there are many other things that are, or could be, combined with certification, I think some of them could more appropriately be done in other ways. Salary classification is one of these that I think is better done separately from certification. That it is feasible to do this has already been demonstrated in a number of places in this country.

The main reason that salary classification should be separated is that it is a very specialized kind of thing. The preparation of teachers is so varied -- I'm thinking horizontally and vertically of the variety of preparation programs and the depth of them -- that this is a special function and can't just be tacked onto certification.

To carry out this classification of salary scheme, I would suggest that it be done by a teachers' organization, or that the teachers' organization should have the major responsibility for it, and the reasons are that teachers have the most direct concern that all teachers should be properly placed on salary scales. This may be of interest to other people such as the department or school board, and so on, but to them it is sort of an academic thing. For teachers, however, this is how they are paid, and thus they have the most direct interest in it. And for the same reason they want to have an impartial scheme for evaluation. Of course everybody would like to have an impartial scheme and such a thing is impossible. But if the teachers' organization is responsible for salary classification, then a partial scheme can be developed.

Another reason for getting teachers into it is that it will keep politics out of it, which is difficult if the arm of government is responsible for this. Another advantage to having teachers do it is that it makes possible the cooperation of the teachers' organization with the department in the policing of certification, because the teachers are just as much concerned as the department of education that people in schools be certificated. Cases do crop up of people whose certificates, say, have been cancelled in another province, or who come along with spurious documents. The fact that another organization looks at the teachers' documents provides a sort of double check.

And finally, another reason for having the teachers' organization involved in this is that it gives the teachers' organization a more authentic voice in matters of teacher education and teaching. If teachers' organizations claim the right to be consulted in decisions on all such matters, if we are going to do that, then I think we had better know something about it. And one way that we will find out something about the classifications of teacher preparation and certification is to get into the business. So those, I think, are good reasons for teacher organizations getting into this area.

I think that evaluation of qualifications should be made in consultation with and with the approval of other interested bodies, such as the departments of education, the universities, and perhaps the trustees' organizations. They don't have a direct interest in it really, but will be concerned about it anyway. To be successful, an evaluation system must also provide for some appeal procedure, that is to say, a procedure by which the teacher can appeal his evaluation.

And I want to suggest a few problems that come to mind. When a teachers' organization takes this responsibility, that organization will of course bear the brunt of the abuse that any organization gets from the teachers who are not satisfied with their evaluation. This is inevitable. I don't suppose it hurts the teachers' organization too much.

The basic problem is the basis on which evaluations are to be made. In Alberta they are made on the basis of years of teacher education, which raises the question, "What's a year?" It has been taken for granted that a year is related to the time it takes to get the B.Ed. degree in Alberta. But as Miss Channon points out in her paper, the length of time may not continue to be the sole factor, and thus something other than a year may be required as the basis for evaluation.

Another problem is establishing a basic principle as to what you are going to count as teacher education. In the Alberta scheme, after over two years of study and soul-searching, decisions were made that we would count only university education, or the equivalent of it in the eyes of the university. That was a hard decision to make.

Another problem, or at least it could be a problem, is that it is necessary, or at least desirable, that there be cooperation with the department of education and the universities that are involved in teacher preparation. It is also necessary to have some cooperation with the school systems, because in order for the scheme to be effective, the school systems must be willing to classify teachers according to the evaluations that have been made under it. The way that is done in Alberta is by a clause in collective agreements between teachers and their employing boards indicating that the evaluations given by the Qualification Service will be used by the board's office for determining salary. The cost of this is quite high for the teachers' association. I suppose the cost could be recovered in fees, but this would make the fees very high. In Alberta, only part of the cost is recovered in fees.

I have suggested three things: that the classification for salary purposes function can be separated and should be separated from other certification functions; I have suggested why I think the teachers' organization is the appropriate body to do it; and I have outlined how it has been done in Alberta.

TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS

RUSSELL MOSHER
Deputy Secretary General
Canadian Teachers' Federation

The purpose of this paper is to provide a background for discussion on teacher assignments in relation to certification. It focuses on needs, practices, trends and problems.

"Proper assignment is the task of placing the right teacher with the right children at the right time."[1] Education authorities have attempted to channel the proper assignment of teachers through different types of certification:

(a) Certificates which have only specific grade validity.

(b) Certificates which have specific subject validity.

(c) Supplementary certificates which indicate a specialist area of validity.

(d) Certificates which differentiate between vocational and academic subject validity.

In her working paper for this Conference, Miss Channon observes that the "overriding rule of certification standards is the law of supply and demand" and that among the necessary functions of an education system are the ensurance of a supply of teachers whose assignments correspond with their talents and training. We have observed that the introduction of various vocational programs in schools across Canada, prior to the establishment of a corps of trained teachers, necessitated special certification procedures in order that teaching stations might be manned. We have witnessed the multiplicity of certificates which tend to indicate minimum, intermediate and superior levels of teacher training. We have seen numerous examples of supplementary certificates which indicate varying amounts of specialist training -- as teachers of a second language, as reading (language arts) specialists, as specialists in the field of work with exceptional children, as teacher-librarians, as guidance counsellors, etc.

Have these certification procedures, varied though they are, met the functions outlined by Miss Channon? Have they tended to ensure a supply of teachers to meet specific demands? Have they had some effect over the assignment of teachers corresponding to their talents and training? Have they had other desirable effects such

---

[1]National Education Association, NCTEPS. The Assignment and Misassignment of American Teachers. Washington: the Association, 1965. 68 p.

as the encouragement of teachers to enter special training programs for which a supplementary certificate was awarded and which often represented some adjustment in classification for salary purposes?

There are some conflicting views on the control of teacher assignments by certification. Dr. Conant proposes rigid state control of teacher assignments. The NEA Report of the Special Committee on the Assignment of Teachers (1965)[2] also emphasizes the need for the state to enforce certification requirements to avoid misassignment. In the same report, however, it notes that school administrators do not want to be limited by overly prescriptive certification requirements. Classrooms must be staffed in spite of the lack of appropriately trained teachers.

The same NEA report provides an interesting insight into the incidence and causes of misassignment in 677 case studies. Forty-five per cent of these misassignments were in rural schools, 28 per cent in suburban schools and 25 per cent in urban schools. Major causes of misassignment listed were:

(a) Inability to recruit the type of teacher needed.

(b) Too limited a school enrolment to provide the breadth of school program demanded.

(c) Late resignations and/or late recruitment programs.

(d) Inadequate evaluation of teacher credentials.

Do these same conditions prevail in Canada? Can we also add another notable cause for misassignment -- lack of consultation with the teacher in the larger school district? It would seem doubtful that certification procedures would have any real effect toward the alleviation of any of these causes of misassignment.

It is apparent that there is a great deal of inconsistency and a lack of clarity as to the degree to which certification governs assignments in Canada. Though over half of the provinces make the attempt to control teacher assignments, there seems to be a trend away from this concept. Miss Channon notes that in Alberta, assignments are left to the discretion of local school boards, to the apparent satisfaction of all.

As the supply of teachers in the various disciplines begins to meet the demand and as minimum qualifications start to level off at a university degree level for elementary as well as secondary school teachers, the trend may well be toward a uniform type of certification. On the other hand, as John Macdonald notes in The

---

[2] Ibid.

Discernible Teacher, the trend toward greater specialization in schools in the future might increase the pressure for recognition of specialist qualifications.

There can be no question as to the need for the development of some standardized practices in teacher certification across Canada. The complexity of the problem of definition of equivalence of certificates from the different provinces and the uncertainties and anxieties related thereto present a formidable barrier to teacher mobility. The whole rationale of teacher certification must be re-examined in the light of today's needs and changing conditions.

THE ROAD TO RECIPROCITY

SOME FIRST STEPS TOWARD RECIPROCITY

GERALDINE CHANNON
Executive Assistant
Canadian Teachers' Federation

Reciprocity is a term which is rather glibly tossed about, with insufficient attention to its real meaning. Like certification, it has become a convenient term for a number of processes. I wonder if we could agree that for our purposes it means agreement among two or more provincial authorities that their training programs are sufficiently rigorous and comparable that each may accept the other's graduates without detailed evaluation. The assumption is that the second province would accept the evaluation accorded the credential by the province which originally awarded it, rather than giving it a new and, generally, inferior rating. To achieve such a situation would require greater comparability, and much greater trust among the educational jurisdictions of Canada, than would appear to exist at present! The amount of trust is difficult to survey. (Although one may note that on an informal basis, many provinces accept each other's programs.) However, one may fairly readily categorize the important kinds of differences which stand in the way of mutual acceptance.

By far the most important barrier is the identification of Junior and Senior Matriculation with different high school grades in different provinces. I am sure I am neither the first nor the last to rail at the inconvenience of an arbitrary, cumbersome, unfair and irrational system which sets up an almost impassible barrier whenever one tries to find a fully acceptable means of interchanging the qualifications issued by various provinces.

It may be salutary to review here again the origin of this unworkable system, through some quotations from Charles Phillips' book, The Development of Education in Canada:

> The institution of two levels of matriculation, though of respectable British origin, was used to cover up educational deficiencies in Canada....
>
> The regrettable and inconvenient differences in standards throughout Canada were recognized in 1892 by Principal Adams of Bishop's College. He recommended to the Dominion Education Association

> a common standard of junior matriculation but unwittingly demonstrated the impracticability of his own proposal by stipulating that Greek should be an obligatory subject for admission to faculties of arts. Half a century later, failure of Canadians to agree, as Americans had agreed, on a uniform terminology and grade level for university entrance, caused much inconvenience and confusion.[1]

It is interesting to note that now, another quarter of a century later, some chinks seem to be appearing in the matriculation wall. I notice an announcement from British Columbia that their Teacher Qualification Service will count all grade 12's from Canada as equal.[2] I note in the Quebec "Entente" the adoption of total years of schooling (from grade one) as the criterion in classifying teachers, rather than years above matriculation.[3] I understand, also, that there has been at least one meeting under the aegis of the Council of Ministers to deal with the implications for transfer students of the adoption of subject promotion and credit systems in high schools. I notice also expressions of discontent with the matriculation system from the Atlantic provinces, where real attempts are being made to bring about some measure of reciprocity.

Is the matriculation system about to break down? Perhaps I should leave you with this question here, making only the additional comment that this is an area where the unilateral decisions of one province could well affect the teachers of another province. Table 1 indicates the effect on the assessing of teacher qualifications of the adoption of, say, a "years of scolarity" approach.

The irrationality of the matriculation system is at the basis of the inability to develop reciprocity of certificates. However, there are a variety of other factors contributing to incompatibility of certification systems, and these have been outlined on page 23 of the working paper. A difficulty not noted there is that some provinces are moving to a system whereby a certificate, virtually a licence, is issued to cover all levels of training from the minimum up, whereas in other provinces a separate name certificate is issued for each level of training. In these circumstances, reciprocity by

---

[1]Phillips, pp. 519-520.

[2]Pamphlet of Teacher Qualification Service, British Columbia.

[3]Entente Concluded between The Government of Quebec, The Quebec Federation of Catholic School Commissions, The Quebec Association of Protestant School Boards on Behalf of the School Boards on the One Hand and The Quebec Teachers Corporation, The Provincial Association of Catholic Teachers and The Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers on Behalf of the Associations of Teachers on the Other Hand. Quebec, 1970, pp. 59-60.

Table 1. Comparison Between Standards As Established Using "Years of Scolarity" and As Established Using "Years Above Junior Matriculation"

Province	At Minimum Certificate Level			At Minimum Degree Level		
	Minimum High School and Training	Years of Scolarity	Years Above Junior Matriculation	Minimum High School and Training	Years of Scolarity	Years Above Junior Matriculation
B.C.	12+3	15	3	12+5	17	5
Alta.	12+3	15	4	12+4	16	5
Sask.	12+2	14	3	12+4	16	5
Man.	12+2	14	3	12+4	16	5
Ont. Present	13+1	14	2	13+3+1	17	5
Starting 1972	13+2	15	3			
Que.	11+2	13	2	11+2+3	16	5
N.B.	12+2	14	2	12+4+1	17	5
*N.S.	11+2	13	2	11+4+1	16	5
**P.E.I.	12+1	13	1	12+4	16	4
Nfld.	11+1	12	1	11+4	15	4

*Minimum certification information for Nova Scotia corrected in discussion session to 11+3; 14; 3 (see p. 33).

**Minimum certification information for Prince Edward Island corrected in discussion session to 12+2; 14; 2 (see p. 33).

certificate name would be meaningless. We can see this by comparing, for example, Alberta and Nova Scotia. These two provinces could agree to honour each other's certificates. Holders of the Alberta Professional certificate would then know that they were eligible for a Nova Scotia certificate class V, VI, VII or VIII. Holders of those four certificates would know they were eligible for an Alberta Professional certificate. But what difference would that make? None would have the slightest clue as to the salary they could expect, or the grades and subjects they would be allowed to teach. Some agency would still have to make evaluations in order to determine salary categories. From this I would draw the conclusion that the only likely basis on which to establish reciprocity would be salary categories, which at present tend to use years of training as their major criterion.

An alternative possibility might be through accreditation of university programs. This seems less likely, however, since the bachelor's degree awarded in one province may require one or two years' more study than that awarded by a neighbouring province. And, in any case, there seems to be no tendency in Canada at all to develop accrediting agencies, either in higher education generally, or in teacher education in particular.

Reciprocity, then, would probably be most meaningful if based on salary categories. It is important to make this distinction, since one can then come to some agreement as to the particular agencies in each province which are most vitally concerned. It is no longer true that only the department of education is particularly concerned. The teacher qualification services also have an important role.

Having identified the agencies concerned, and the type of classification for which reciprocity might have some meaning, one may then begin to think realistically of some steps that might be taken toward reciprocal recognition of teachers' credentials. Reluctantly, one must admit that the initial steps would not involve very much reduction in the amount of red tape, which is one of the sources of irritation for migrant teachers. Red tape and duplication of evaluations cannot be avoided as long as each province feels it must itself screen out the incompetent, the underqualified and the impostors by gathering and studying sets of credentials. Even if the public authority were to accredit out-of-province programs, some proof of completion would be needed, along with the usual references from previous employers. The only possible substitute might be a reputable national agency maintaining cumulative records and a register of qualified teachers, and providing standard reports to the various provincial jurisdictions on request. Any national approach of this sort would without a doubt be the very last step in the development of reciprocity. It seems much more likely that we must first move through stages of unilateral recognition and

regional reciprocity. It is in regard to the first stage, in particular, that I feel some progress could be made and to which I would now like to direct attention.

Phase One -- Unilateral Recognition

It seems to me that there is one basic right which should be accorded teachers moving from one educational jurisdiction in Canada to another. This is the right to know which agencies in the province to which they are going are actually empowered to rule on such matters as acceptance for certification, salary classification, teaching assignment and rating of experience. They should have the right to know this before they go to that province and before they apply formally to any province for certification.

I feel fairly certain that many teachers experience considerable difficulty in obtaining this advance information. We know of many cases where disappointment has arisen through ignorance or misunderstanding of the second province's regulations. Moreover, we have been told of instances where there has been deliberate misrepresentation by persons who did not in fact have the power of decision to which they laid claim.

I am therefore proposing to you, as the first step toward reciprocity, that there be agreement in principle that teachers moving from one province to another should have, in advance of their move, a very clear idea regarding:

1. the agencies in the new province which have authority in regard to certification, salary classification, teaching assignments, rating of previous experience and promotion policy

2. the documents which must be submitted to each of these agencies and any fees that must be paid

3. any special courses which must be taken to qualify for a certificate

4. amount of probationary service required to obtain a permanent certificate in the new province

5. the approximate certificate category and salary category to which the teacher's preparation will entitle him.

Teachers ought to have this information, and they ought to have it in comparable form. Moreover, complete information ought to be available from one source. At present, CEA, CTF, the Department of Manpower, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and perhaps

other agencies are all busily collecting different parts of the needed information. It is probably time for one agency to assume major responsibility for maintaining a clearinghouse of authoritative data on the requirements to be met by migrant teachers.

It may be noted that the kind of information asked for in advance goes beyond the information on where and how to apply which is currently available. It asks, in addition, for sample rulings on placement in salary categories. I must hasten to note that I do not think it would be possible either to provide or to compile rulings on all the certificates that have ever been issued or on all levels of qualification from grade 9 + 2 years up. The mind boggles at the number of combinations and permutations that would be involved. However, the task becomes much more manageable if we limit it as follows:

1. only qualifications involving a degree should be included

2. only current programs of preparation should be included.

Admittedly, these restrictions leave out vocational teachers. However, after all, we are talking about some first steps which have yet to be taken despite fifty years of discussion. The initial work involved would be the assessment of certain typical patterns of training by the agencies of each province for all of the other provinces. Two or three preparation programs for each province would probably have to be assessed. The result might be the possibility of making statements such as those in the following examples:

Examples

Person who completed in British Columbia a grade 12 (Junior Matriculation) and a five-year B.Ed. and receives on that basis a Professional Certificate

(a) will in Alberta be (1) granted a Professional Certificate (Interim)
(2) assessed as salary category _____
(3) permitted to teach any subject at any grade level, as assigned by the local school board

(Exceptions: -)

And may qualify for a higher salary category by - - - - - - -

(b) will in Saskatchewan be (1) granted a permanent Professional Certificate
(2) assigned a salary category by the Department of Education
(3) permitted to teach any subject at any grade level, as assigned.

(Exceptions: -)

and so on across the country.

It might be that the study involved here could lead to unilateral recognition of at least some preparation programs. For example, it might be agreed that graduates of certain universities from a certain date on need not be asked for high school transcripts. As well, some provinces might ask themselves whether they require documentary proof of everything. For example, is it really necessary to view a woman teacher's marriage certificate?

From internal recognition of certain preparation programs it would be only a short step to public recognition. I am sure it would be of considerable interest to various preparing institutions to know where their graduates are considered acceptable (and also where they are not). Teaching graduates would also like to know, in some cases in advance, where else their qualifications are valued. There is little lustre to a certificate which is only approved at home.

Two other steps might be taken to indicate unilateral recognition. It might be agreed that teaching experience is teaching experience,wherever gained. Where teachers possess a permanent certificate in good standing and have proof of successful teaching experience equal to the amount required of beginning teachers in the province they are entering, it seems unnecessary to insist that another long probationary period be endured. Many provinces have tenure laws to deal with incompetence. Is it necessary that certification deal with it in this way also?

Finally, one might note that there is good reason to recommend that the special little courses on provincial school law, etc., that still exist in some places, be dropped entirely. Such matters can be more readily handled through orientation programs for new teachers at the school level. Certainly, the educational systems seem to have suffered no damage which could be attributed to the general decision across much of the country to drop this requirement for immigrant teachers.

I have spent a good deal of time on different kinds of "unilateral recognition" which would move us closer to reciprocity. Probably what I have outlined is the limit to what might be expected nationally in the near future. However, I would like to go on a little further to mention briefly some steps that may become possible later on.

Phase Two -- Regional Reciprocity

Mr. Adams from New Brunswick will be outlining the progress made towards reciprocity in the Atlantic provinces. I don't wish to steal from his remarks by going into detail, but would merely note how heartening it is to find that some of the registrars and

teacher representatives in Canada are getting together to discuss, compare and standardize the technical details of certification.

I am certain that this experiment will be watched with interest by other provinces as a test case on the possibility of working out acceptable reciprocal arrangements.

In the meantime, I might suggest that there are other possibilities in Canada for developing reciprocity. Provinces with the same junior-senior matriculation system, such as British Columbia and Ontario, may have some firm ground for reciprocity. As well, other provinces in geographic proximity may have grounds and incentive for reciprocity. In this category the three prairie provinces are a natural choice.

The leading edge in certification, then, is beyond Phase One and into Phase Two. I do not think I will try to make detailed suggestions for going beyond Phase Two at present, except to suggest that there might be two more phases. Phase Three would be the development of reciprocal arrangements among all the provinces and Phase Four the institution of some kind of national recognition in the form of a National Certificate or a National Registry of Teachers. (We understand at least one province may move in the direction of a registry.) For these phases, it would be a sufficient step today to become committed to the desirability of reciprocity and to agree, perhaps, that it would be desirable to continue with annual national meetings through which registrars, evaluators and teachers could meet together to discuss mutual problems and policies in certification.

RESPONSE RE FEASIBILITY

DAVID M. EATON
Assistant Secretary
Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation

I would like to prefix my remarks today with some reference to the O.S.S.T.F. certification services, so that you will be aware of the context in which I am speaking. In Ontario we have three bodies involved in the "certification" of teachers. The Department of Education is involved because it issues the basic licence to teach and the myriad of basic and specialist certificates. The colleges of education are involved in "certification" in that they help control the qualifications required for various specialist certificates and also offer a multitude of courses which teachers may take in order to upgrade their qualifications. The O.S.S.T.F. has been involved for the past 12 years in setting the standard for the four certification groups in secondary school teaching -- a standard which has been accepted by most of the boards of education

in the province. Our relationship with the Department of Education is, at the same time, both simple and complex. The Department must issue a basic certificate before we will place a teacher in one of the four groupings. A local board of education would use this grouping statement as a basis for payment, because most local negotiators have written the O.S.S.T.F. grouping requirement into their salary contracts.

Reciprocity in my mind begins at home and in our situation involves the three bodies mentioned previously. A teacher from another province attempting to find out his "certification" position in Ontario might have to write to all of these bodies. Our new booklet, O.S.S.T.F. Certification 4, of which you have a copy, outlines the requirements for grouping in one of the four categories. We actually issue a Group Rating Statement which the teacher can use as verification of his placement. Where a local board in Ontario uses the O.S.S.T.F. chart, the teacher would be paid accordingly. Would you look for a moment on page 10 of this booklet which outlines the requirements for the academic chart. You can note in Group 3 that the requirement is a High School Specialist, or Interim High School Assistant's Type A Certificate. However, if you will look on the chart on page 11, Art, Group 3 requires a Permanent High School Assistant's or Interim High School Assistant's Type B Certificate plus a Specialist Certificate in Art plus three courses (2nd-class average), either related university or approved Art courses. It is obvious from this comparison that we do not treat all Specialist Certificates issued by the Department of Education alike. Some teachers, in our opinion, require additional qualifications when they have received a certain specialist certificate whereas other teachers, with different specialist certificates, do not.

It is possible in Ontario that a teacher could have a complete file of his academic qualifications at the Department of Education, at the College of Education and at the Certification Office of O.S.S.T.F., and although all three bodies enjoy good rapport and liaison, we have not yet come to the point where we exchange the information in these files, except in a few specific cases. It would appear on the surface that some streamlining needs to be done within the province of Ontario before we can speak seriously about reciprocity with other provinces.

However, the ideas outlined in the paper by Miss Channon, "Some First Steps Towards Reciprocity", are indeed interesting and appropriate. Here I can comment only from the point of view of O.S.S.T.F., and this might or might not be in agreement with the Ontario Department of Education's feelings on the subject. I believe that the first five items mentioned on page 7 of this paper are the very least we would be able to accomplish. An up-to-date information bank on the certification requirements and authorities in all of the provinces located, probably, at CTF would be of valuable service to:

1. Practising teachers
2. Potential teachers
3. Boards of education
4. Departments of education
5. Colleges of education
6. Teachers' federations
7. Universities
8. Teachers immigrating to Canada (to some extent)

I believe also that this conference should attempt to look positively at reciprocity, and with this in mind I wonder why we could not discuss the idea of having at least one certificate which would be acceptable without question in any province; that certificate could be four years of academic and teacher training beyond senior matriculation.

THE FEASIBILITY AND DESIRABILITY OF RECIPROCITY

E. A. COUCH
Evaluator
Teacher Qualification Service
British Columbia

This part of the program, from what I've heard so far, may be a little bit surprising, but I think the position for me to take at this point is, perhaps, that of Devil's Advocate. When we talk about reciprocity in evaluation I am not too certain that I understand clearly what we are considering. If it is, as has been stated, the willingness of the authority of one province to accept the evaluation awarded by the authority of another province, then I can conceive that while, like all things, reciprocity might be possible, I also believe that it is neither desirable nor necessary. If, on the other hand, all that is implied is a reciprocal exchange of information, then I am surprised it does not now exist.

Evaluation, in the sense we are using it here, is based upon items of training acceptable to the evaluating authority in order to carry out its stated purpose. At this point one might engage in a philosophical discussion on what is training and to what extent such training has applicability in the school situation. An English teacher who has had extensive experience in amateur theatricals may do more effective teaching and make a greater educational contribution through his sponsorship of an extra-curricular drama program based upon his interest and his avocational experience than he does through all his so-called academic and professional courses.

The only reason we include the latter and not the former in the evaluation of that teacher's training is because some recognized authority claims to have been able to measure the one while no one is prepared to evaluate the latter.

To accept reciprocity there must be a readiness to accept a training, a preparation and an evaluation that has been established by some exterior authority. But there are so many variables and complexities involved that I doubt the wisdom of striving towards such a goal. Is it really worth the time and effort? How long would it take to achieve? Would it ever be achieved? Moreover, while it has been suggested that a teacher may suffer when he moves from one province to another, may it not also happen that he may benefit? Who is sure he has the best measuring stick?

The sources of many of the difficulties associated with equating certificates have been outlined in the working paper and there is no need to repeat them here, but I would like to believe that we are today experiencing a movement away from a system of evaluation operated by a department of education to one which is evolved out of the cooperative efforts of the department of education, the faculties of education, the teachers' association and the trustees' association of a province. Inasmuch as all those concerned are involved, and provided all have equal voice, this would seem to be a solid base on which to build and a process which should be fostered. It will, however, in my opinion, be an extremely difficult task to attain a common ground among two provincial sets of such, and an exercise in futility to attempt to move all ten provincial sets to a common accord.

It has been suggested that once it is established that the basic requirement for certification is the bachelor's degree, this might provide a first step towards reciprocity. Alternatively, it has been proposed that categories based upon years of training might be a more desirable means of establishing reciprocity. In my limited experience the regular three-year or four-year degree presents no problem providing there is agreement and understanding of what the counting base shall be. I would be reluctant to say a degree is a degree, however, for I can not quite bring myself to accept wholeheartedly a degree in political science, anthropology or psychology as representing sound preparation for the classroom, and what evaluation should be placed on a degree in applied science, social work or law? In the case of each of the latter, should we count the total number of years required to the degree and evaluate accordingly? Should a successful year be accepted as a year, even though it is a first year in another faculty, or should only vertical years leading to a degree be counted? Evaluation of points such as these can only be achieved arbitrarily and probably only unilaterally. Whether agreement could ever be attained beyond the bounds of one province is problematical.

If, as one hears constantly, education today is in a time of change, any attempt to establish reciprocity might limit opportunities to effect change. If we sincerely believe that teachers should be encouraged to innovate, to experiment with new methods, new approaches and new media, then to effect this we should encourage our training institutions to foster this approach in their training programs. But if we establish a system of reciprocity may we not be in danger of establishing stereotyped programs? Might not patterns of preparation tend to stagnate as institutions seek to satisfy the common requirement established for them through some reciprocal agreement?

If we were fortunate enough to have some omniscient person who could tell us what the ideal preparation of a teacher should be, and if we had some omnipotent body which could, by decree, establish this preparation, reciprocity would be feasible, but I believe I would still oppose it for the simple reason of its possible smothering influence on our total educational endeavour.

Lacking such pretentious persons, then, reciprocity would compel us to resolve whose philosophy and whose program should prevail, and even though we were able to agree upon this, how would we bring about a change? If, for example, we are able to agree on the desirability of differentiated staffs for schools, where do we begin -- in the schools, where they now say they can't implement the plan without the trained personnel, or in the training institution, where they say it is futile to establish such training if there are no positions to fill? To encourage experimentation, is it not preferable to have local authorities, under some supervision, free to try out some plans, rather than to have nothing happen because they feel they must cling to an established position of reciprocity?

I would be concerned that reciprocity might tend to lock-step the nation and smother initiative and experimentation. I would fear that training programs would tend to pattern themselves on the reciprocal model, be it in certification or in category. I would wonder whether training programs would tend to follow the mode rather than to continue to seek for that ideal preparation which has evaded us for so long.

I do not agree that insofar as British Columbia is concerned there is any tendency to assign inferior ratings to classifications granted in other provinces. This may seem to occur, but basically the classification granted will be one that is based upon British Columbia equivalencies as established from time to time by the appropriate authority. Presumably the evaluative principles that exist in any one province now have developed over the years out of the aims and philosophy of the people in that province and presumably are based upon the willingness and ability of its citizens to pay. Because these principles have been developed in this way it does not necessarily pre-suppose that they would be welcomed

elsewhere or that they would necessarily be financially possible for a sister province to support.

I would ask why do we want reciprocity? Is there a real need? It has been suggested that there is a need to have a central bureau of information where teachers moving from one province to another may learn what policies are in force and what agencies are involved with respect to certification, classification, teaching assignment and rating of experience. This proposal I can heartily support. However, I do believe, and again I can speak only from limited experience, that all of this information is readily available now in British Columbia and would presume that the same is true for all other provinces. I regret to say that I can see no need to establish a central registry of teachers for Canada. I accept the point that teachers are much more mobile than they once were but I wonder if the mobile group is so numerous that it has created a real need of this kind. I would also wonder whether the current fiscal policies across the nation and the present seeming excess of supply over demand for teachers may not tend to reduce mobility considerably.

In British Columbia, in years gone by, the Department of Education issued the certificate, classified it and determined the number of years of recognized experience, and these factors were directly related to the grant structure for the province. About two years ago the Department established a new financial formula for education and announced it would no longer engage in classification of certificates and in determining years of experience. In order to fill the void which was thus created, the British Columbia Teachers' Federation and the British Columbia School Trustees' Association jointly established the Teacher Qualification Service in 1969 to provide an advisory service for teachers, local teachers' associations and school boards.

The Teacher Qualification Service itself is composed of four representatives from each of the British Columbia Teachers' Federation and the British Columbia School Trustees' Association. These eight appoint two representatives from each association to form the Teacher Qualification Board. The Teacher Qualification Board in turn chooses its own chairman. The duties of the Teacher Qualification Board are to establish principles for the evaluation of years of academic and professional preparation beyond British Columbia Grade XII, or its equivalent, and to assign categories to the levels of training so established. It does not engage directly in matters of certification, salary or evaluation of experience. The Board inherited an already established, well-entrenched system of certification and classification policies which had been formulated over the years by the Department of Education, perhaps with some consultation with the university. The Board, to some degree, has followed the established pattern, but has not hesitated to set out its own principles and, although new, has exerted some influence

in matters of certification. It is now being consulted with respect to the training and courses which it feels should be undertaken to fill a category requirement.

For obvious reasons the Board has a basic tenet that teachers trained elsewhere shall have their training evaluated on a basis that is no less but no more favourable than that applied to teachers trained in British Columbia. There is no attempt to assign an inferior rating nor is there a lack of trust in the training carried out elsewhere. The principles for evaluation which are established by the Board determine classification and apply equally to all applicants for an evaluation. A category is assigned only to the holder of a valid British Columbia certificate. Certificates are granted by the Department of Education and classification does not always pattern the certificate that is granted by the Department. What salary level may be attached to the classification category is determined in the salary agreement negotiated between the local teachers' association and board of school trustees.

I feel that such an approach to classification is sound. It leaves the certification under state control, provides a system of checks and balances, and places the responsibility for categorization directly in the hands of the teachers' and trustees' associations.

The Board has not tried to hide its operation or its methods. It has published and distributed to all teachers, school boards, and district superintendents, and through the cooperation of the universities to all of this year's teacher-graduates, a brochure outlining its function and operation. It has, during the short term of its operations, endeavoured to live up to its name and to provide effective service, not only to teachers in British Columbia, but to teachers elsewhere when they contact it for information. It would agree that teachers are entitled to know what they may expect, and it has sent the brochure to every department of education and every teachers' association across Canada so that they may know, too.

If the aim of reciprocity as stated is to provide a clearing house of general information for teachers moving from one province to another then I see nothing against this. If, on the other hand, the aim is to establish common certification, common classifications, common salary bases, then I feel that it is but one short step removed from establishing the teachers of the country as another branch of the civil service and creates another agency to be satisfied by many for the sake of a few.

Quite frankly, I feel a centralized system might become quite cumbersome and cause more delays and frustrations than we now have. I see little wrong with the philosophy that, "If you want to play in my ball game you play according to my rules," so long as the rules are made known before the game begins.

Finally, if there is any effort made towards reciprocity I believe it should be made on behalf of the evaluator. He is the one who bears the brunt of the problems, is berated for his pains, and who really needs your concern. Anything that will bring some lessening in the myriad certificates and programs, that will eradicate all the time factors, the course requirements and the like, would be most appreciated.

UNIFORMITY IN TEACHER CERTIFICATION IN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES

R. D. ADAMS
Registrar
New Brunswick Department of Education

The study of Uniformity in Teacher Certification in the Atlantic Provinces originated concurrently with the ministers of education and the Atlantic teachers' associations. As the result of a meeting of the Atlantic ministers of education during the 1969 Federal-Provincial Conference in Ottawa, the registrars were requested to study the conditions governing all aspects of teacher certification and report to the ministers in July. This report disclosed major differences in procedures of application for certification, the evaluation of qualifications and the recognition of experience for salary purposes. Basic uniformity was noted in procedures of appeal and means of dealing with the evaluation of qualifications from foreign countries.

In June 1969 the Atlantic teachers' organizations held a two-day symposium to which the registrars were invited to hear Miss Channon present a similar paper and to participate in the discussion. As a result of the report by the registrars and the discussion which surrounded the symposium it was agreed that further study was both necessary and important if reciprocity was to become more than a good intention.

In January 1970 the first of four joint meetings, comprising equal representation from the Atlantic teachers' organizations and the departments of education was held "to study certification and related problems and to explore methods by which uniformity of policies and practices could be attained."

We were most fortunate to have Mr. Norman Goble present at the first meeting and benefited greatly from his knowledge of conditions throughout Canada. At that meeting Mr. Kingett and the other teacher organization representatives proposed that our regional study be extended to the national level and through the cooperation and facilities of the Canadian Teachers' Federation it has become a reality, similar to that of the 1968 conference.

As the result of four meetings the Atlantic joint committee has presented the first draft to the respective bodies for reaction. In principle the committee has agreed to:

1. Endorse a uniform system of application for teacher certification in the Atlantic provinces.

2. Endorse a uniform fee structure for assessment of teacher qualifications from outside the province.

3. Endorse a uniform system for the recognition of:

   (a) teaching experience
   (b) approved related work experience.

4. Endorse a more uniform system of evaluating academic and professional qualification for certification.

5. Endorse common time limits for the validity of certificates after initial certification.

6. Endorse a common structure for specialist certificates.

7. Endorse the concept of an Atlantic Provinces Certification Board.

8. Endorse a common policy approach to non-certified personnel performing as teachers.

9. Endorse a common format of issuing licences and certificates.

The establishment of a uniform system of application is vital if reciprocity is to become a reality. While it will not immediately eliminate the so-called "red tape", it will assure other provinces that the applicant has been dealt with in an official manner and should put us on the road to eventual reciprocity.

In the Atlantic provinces we have agreed to a uniform application form requesting from the applicant:

1. Name in full
2. Address
3. Date of birth (certificate optional)
4. Official verification directly from institution or department for:

   (a) Academic and professional post-secondary training
   (b) Verification of validity of license
   (c) Experience

5. Medical examination form

6. Fee -- if applicable

In New Brunswick and Newfoundland official verification of academic and professional qualifications, the teaching licence and experience enable a precise salary to be quoted, in view of the implementation of the uniform salary scales. Individual local scales in the other provinces do not permit a precise salary quotation from the provincial body. In all cases, positions of responsibility at the local level account for additional advances.

The uniform fee structure presently employed in New Brunswick has been unanimously adopted to counteract the many frivolous duplicated applications which are received. The fee structure is as follows:

1. $10 -- for initial evaluation of qualifications of applicants from outside the province.

2. $5 -- re-evaluation fee for teachers licensed in the province but teaching elsewhere.

3. No fee for applicants educated in and/or presently teaching in the province.

4. $2 -- fee for a statement of validity (license) issued directly to another province or institution on behalf of a teacher.

In the Atlantic provinces existing policies concerning the recognition of teaching and/or related work experience present a definite barrier to any means of uniformity and eventual reciprocity. These differences range from full recognition for all teaching experience, including time spent at university improving the level of certification, to a maximum of seven years regardless of the actual total.

Miss Channon has expressed the difficulty of determining the exact termination of secondary education and the true beginning of post-secondary education. This problem is creating a serious hinderance to uniformity and reciprocity in the Atlantic provinces. Our findings indicate that it is undesirable to consider any level below the basic four-year bachelor's degree or the equivalent, if we are really serious about reciprocity.

The answer appears to be the years of post-secondary training with the successful completion of secondary education as the base. The moves by British Columbia and Quebec are definitely in the right direction but they both contain minor weaknesses. British Columbia still eliminates Quebec under the former plan and Newfoundland under the present plan. If provision could be made then their

plan would appear to be the answer. Quebec's plan discriminates against their own people in that the successful completion of secondary education (formerly Grade 11) and an approved four-year degree only warrants level fifteen; whereas grade twelve plus the same four-year degree from any other province warrants level sixteen.

The one important factor involved in years of scolarity after the true termination of secondary education is that it will eliminate the false impression that the last year of secondary education is equivalent to first year of university simply because that province says it is senior matriculation. To a large degree the university competition for students has forced us to accept degrees on their title rather than their exact content.

Miss Channon has referred in her working paper to the former east-west exodus of highly qualified teachers and the present west-east exodus of unqualified or lowly qualified teachers. The Atlantic provinces could allow themselves to become a haven for such people due to their lower minimal standards. In view of the national situation of teacher supply and demand, and on the basic proposition that no move towards reciprocity or uniformity should cause any one province to lower its standards, it is vital that the minimal level of acceptance be the four-year bachelor's degree (including teacher training) or the equivalent for all migrant teachers. This would still permit a province to license its locally-trained teachers according to existing conditions, but would not compel another province to lower its standard of acceptance.

In summary, the recommendations of the Atlantic Joint Committee speak in favour of a much more uniform system of teacher certification and eventual reciprocity.

In view of the conditions presented in Miss Channon's working paper and her suggested steps towards national reciprocity, it would therefore seem appropriate that serious consideration be given to:

1. The establishment of a uniform system of application for teacher certification (fee structure -- optional)

2. The establishment of a uniform system for the recognition of:

   (a) teaching experience, and
   (b) approved related experience for salary purposes.

3. The establishment of a uniform system (or at least a more uniform system) of evaluating academic and professional qualifications on the basis of the number of approved years of study beyond the termination of secondary education, with the level of the four-year

bachelor's degree or equivalent the minimal standard of acceptance from another province.

4. The establishment of a uniform format with respect to the terminology, meaning, and duration of validity of documents issued for purposes of teacher certification.

5. The continuation of the study of uniformity and reciprocity both at the regional and the national level through the joint cooperation of the national and provincial teachers' federations and the provincial departments of education.

In closing, although this point does not deal specifically with reciprocity, I would like to mention that Mr. Wicks and Mr. Lynd are here today from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and that through their kind cooperation the Department of Education in New Brunswick has now established a much improved system of teacher information services. I should just like to recommend this -- I know other provinces have adopted it. In a sense it is indirectly related to reciprocity in that it provides a wealth of information, free of charge. (This is something that is very important in this day and age.) And if the province of New Brunswick could receive comparable information from DBS for other provinces, as they do for their own province, then I'm sure that reciprocity would be more than a series of questions.

PLENARY DISCUSSION

L. P. Patterson

On page 5 of Miss Channon's most excellent paper, it talks about reciprocity being meaningful if based on salary categories and I really don't understand what this means. The idea is all right but I haven't the faintest idea what it comprehends, what is intimated or what it is all about. I wonder if Miss Channon would not tell us more exactly -- for instance, a person who made $6,000 in one province might not be in the same salary category as a person who made $6,000 in another province. Is that what it means?

Geraldine Channon

Well, my idea was that in the case of salary classifications, evaluations are made generally in terms of years of training, so that you have a category for each additional year of training, and usually salaries are paid on that basis. So that you would come to agreement that Category 2 in one province is equal to Category 3 in another and this would be the basis for reciprocity. If you try to do it in terms of certificate names you won't get anywhere

because one certificate from a particular province may be equal potentially to three or four certificates in another province.

Patterson

Then you are relating these to salary categories. This category relates to that one. But isn't your fundamental philosophy, what you are talking about, something like years of training, or years of scolarity? Isn't this the fundamental thinking behind the whole thing? It isn't salary categories.

Channon

Well, what I'm thinking of is what people are really interested in knowing, which is what salary they will receive.

Patterson

That may be, but . . .

Reginald MacDonald

In other words, P.E.I. should step up their name by one step, in line with the other Atlantic provinces, for one thing. Is that what you mean? Our Certificate One is equivalent in name to Certificate Two in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Newfoundland.

Channon

Oh yes. The Atlantic provinces are a special case, because their certificate categories are also salary categories, but this is not true everywhere.

Patterson

Suppose one province has seven categories and the other one has five, isn't the common denominator affecting us again? Isn't the common denominator years of training rather than artificial salary categories?

Channon

That's right.

Patterson

Now I'm trying to get back to the problem of what's all behind this.

Emerson Arnett

Would this boil down to the idea that Manitoba, for example, would sit down and carefully classify its salary categories in terms of the certificates and years of training for Ontario, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and all the provinces, and then send that information to all those provinces? Then in Ontario, a teacher wanting to go to Manitoba could go to a central place in Ontario where they would find out that these are the qualifications and this is the probable salary category they would be in in Manitoba? Then if each province does this, it's really in a sense a kind of reciprocity.

A. Sutton

It would be impossible to give a person an answer to this type of question. If he wished to teach in Kapuskasing and if he wished to teach in Toronto . . . . all you can tell him is the range.

Channon

But you can tell him the category. One shouldn't confuse salaries with salary categories.

Norman Bernstein

There seems to be confusion in all four papers between certification, which the last gentleman suggests is qualification to teach and a licence, in effect, and salary categorization. Presumably, salary categorization, like actual salaries, is determined through a different process than certification. Certification is merely permission, or a licence to teach, however it may be determined. But salary categorization, along with salary scales, may be the same, but it may not. But it can be determined, and should be determined, through collective negotiations. The pattern of categorization may differ substantially from the pattern of certification, and if you link the two together you get into inevitable confusion which will prolong these conferences well into the 22nd century.

Sutton

I am just asking whether Mr. Eaton would be prepared, for example, to give the differential within Category 1 in his OSSTF chart which he has passed around. As a provincial government we're completely out of categories and salary matters for their good graces. But just consider the differences in the way in which boards may interpret work experience and teaching experience -- at the local level, isn't it David?

David Eaton

Yes. Our Category 1 as defined here requires the basic Ontario Type B certificate which is three years of training after grade 13 plus a year of teacher training. This year it looks as though it will vary from about $7,000 up to as high as $8,200, depending upon the area in the province. If you said the person would likely make $7,100 that would take care of a great deal of your southern boundaries. Then there is the question, and I don't want to get into this, of experience counting, which the teacher wants to know. In our province this is up to the local boards, and again there is another agency involved.

J. W. Killeen

I wonder if Mr. Eaton and Mr. Couch would give us some idea of the costs of running their particular services and where the funds come from to pay for the particular services which they offer.

Eaton

We look after the service ourselves at the teachers' federation. This year I have budgeted $70,000 to look after this, mainly for salaries, of course. I have five full-time evaluators now, with typing and clerical assistance, and we are hoping before the end of the year to have this up to six or seven evaluators. There is all this heaviness just in our own area, and we don't do all of it, the department does a lot of it too. So we have budgeted $70,000. The service is free to all members, but a member who is not a legal or statutory member as such would be charged for a voluntary membership fee plus $10 for the rating statement, but for members it is free.

Killeen

A supplementary question on that. Are there any hidden costs? Are you putting your building expenditures in that, your heat, your power, the whole works?

Eaton

Yes, we charge in a nominal cost of rent. I am sure, though, that if we had a separate Evaluation Service, as our colleagues in the coastal and elementary areas are doing, this would up our costs quite naturally, because we get cheap rent.

E. A. Couch

Our budget is $50,000, contributed equally by the British Columbia Teachers' Federation and the British Columbia School Trustees' Association. The staff consists of myself and one lady. We are in a separate building from both the teachers' and trustees' associations.

Arthur Welbourne

Just to divert for one moment, Mr. Chairman, in regard to Mr. Adams from New Brunswick, Quebec is not 11+4 but, as is stated on page 4[1] of Miss Channon's document, it is 11+2+3. However, what I really would like to ask is a very concrete question. I am the Director of Teacher Certification, God help me, for Quebec, and in days when I am sitting in my office contemplating suicide, I would be delighted to have a copy of the speech or the paper of the gentleman from British Columbia, whose name I do not know, with the Don Rickles approach, and if that were possible, I would be extremely delighted and I would have a reason to go on living, I enjoyed it that much. Is there any possibility of having a copy of this marvellous paper, with its irony and sardonic approach which warms my tired old Irish heart?

Channon

The paper will be available in the proceedings of the meeting.

Phillip Carter

Just a comment and a question. Also on the same chart, on page 4[1], for Nova Scotia, minimum high school and training should be 11+3, years of scolarity 14 and years above junior matriculation 3. And then, just a note, on page 7[2] the comment was made that there should be complete information from one source. In Nova Scotia it's very definitely from one source. The teacher has only to contact one agency, the department of education in this case, to get complete information on salary range, certificate, years of service and so on.

MacDonald

On page 4[1], opposite Prince Edward Island, our minimum requirement is grade 12 plus 2 years of training sequence and 14 years of scolarity.

Ray Wight

On pages 6 and 7[2] of Miss Channon's report she made five recommendations. She thought that a teacher moving from one province to another should have this information. Then on page 7, that it was probably time for one agency to assume major responsibility

---

[1]See page 13.
[2]See page 15.

for maintaining a clearinghouse. I am just wondering if CTF wouldn't logically be that agency and what would be required to get CTF to collate this information and distribute it to teacher organizations.

Unidentified

Raise the fees.

Channon

Well, I think if this body felt that CTF should do it, they could put this forward as a recommendation to CTF, which already has a policy that favours reciprocity of one kind or another. I would hope that if it is recommended that CTF do it, that it would be accompanied by a commitment from the people here to provide the needed information. It would be hard to do if people would not agree to provide the information.

Arthur Kratzmann

I just want to ask a question of the total group, if I might. It seems to me that intra-provincial reciprocity has to precede interprovincial reciprocity, and I am wondering whether in British Columbia we are unique in that we really don't have this kind of reciprocity among our teacher education institutions, nor do we have it between them and the department, nor necessarily between the department and the teacher qualification service. If you take any side of the triangle I think you will find a lack of parallelism, at least at certain points. Are we unique or are we not? Just a general response from anyone.

Bernstein

British Columbia is obviously not unique.

Carter

We have seven teacher training institutions in Nova Scotia, counting Mount Allison as part of the family, and it can be the case that a single course, even within teacher preparation, may not be accredited by another institution. I think that is going to resolve itself, probably within the next 12 or 15 months.

Kratzmann

I wonder if people would agree with my assumption that if we can get reciprocity within provinces, we will get some among provinces also. Obviously Mr. Couch and I do not agree, necessarily, on the same subject.

Sutton

In Ontario at the present time a teachers' college or a university, of which some of the teachers' colleges are now a part, recommends for the basic elementary school teacher's certificate, and there is no difficulty. The same thing is true in secondary education where the college of education in Ontario recommends for the basic high school teacher's certificate. So we have no problem there.

J. C. Struthers

I would think in Saskatchewan you don't have any particular problem. The universities, the teachers' federation and the Department cooperate in this matter pretty well, I would say, and there is not really a problem of reciprocity within the province.

H. P. Moffat

Mr. Chairman, I would like to relate my remarks to something that Mr. Couch said, in the course of his address. However, with regard to the situation in Manitoba at the present time, we do have just the two teacher training institutions, Brandon University and the University of Manitoba, taking very divergent approaches to the programs in certification. Brandon has come up with a Bachelor of Teaching degree, an elementary 3-year degree. That is just one example. I am delighted to see this divergence. I think if we are going to get anywhere in education we must have newer approaches and imaginative approaches, and I think we are getting them to some extent in Manitoba -- that's a plug for the home province.

We did get on this topic of reciprocity this morning, our group, perhaps a bit prematurely. Having supported it this morning and suggested that perhaps it should be started, as Mr. Adams has indicated, or perhaps it was Miss Channon, at the level of a bachelor's degree plus a year of teacher training, I was quite set back to hear Mr. Couch say that this might lead to stagnation of a certain type. The idea that the different provinces, the different teacher training institutions, in attempting to meet this common requirement for certification -- I hope it would never get to that, that they would limit their programs, restrict them to the lowest common denominator, if you like, rather than something that is imaginative and stimulating.

I can't see why this should be the case. If we are prepared to accept the graduates from a well recognized training institution, why should we expect them to have Manitoba requirements? We don't do this right now, in Manitoba. If they come in from England or any of the other provinces, we don't try to have them meet a Manitoba requirement. Surely they also have ideas about teacher training, teacher education, and -- we know, of course, that we've got the best

system in the world-- but let's accept others as second best. The point that I would like to make here is that, if we are satisfied with the teacher training institution, as a training institution, let's accept their graduates, accept them from anywhere in Canada, from anywhere in the United States or Great Britain or any other place. They will come in and because of the fact that they have had a different training, I think we are likely to come up with a better teacher training program and with a more varied approach in certification matters. It bothered me considerably to hear these statements made and I found your remarks most challenging and very interesting. But the idea that stagnation might be the result of reciprocity, well, it seems to me it could work the other way.

Couch

I would agree with you completely, if it would work. But I think we are a long way away from that and that the minute we start setting up patterns of reciprocity and are big enough to accept a program from somewhere else, then that institution, rather than innovate, rather than experiment, would ensure that its graduates fit the requirements that someone else has laid down, rather than develop any points of its own -- this is my concern.

Stirling McDowell

It just occurs to me that if in the province of Saskatchewan we said that a particular individual is qualified as a teacher in Regina but not in Saskatoon, we would appear ridiculous, and yet this is precisely what we are doing on a provincial basis. And to me one of the imperatives in looking at progress toward reciprocity is the way in which the public, I think, has come to view the whole situation, as being absolutely ridiculous that a person is qualified in one province but not in another.

Arnett

What may be the key to this is that you don't get into the details but that you set a level which is based on some general criteria such as years of preparation or an arts degree plus a year of teacher preparation -- something in this area -- and that you don't delve into the details. I think we are opening up our public schools in this way, so that two students going through grade 1 to grade 12, even in the same school, let alone two different schools, might take quite different courses. I think what was damaging before was the details of curriculum and the final examination. Now if we keep this element out of it, perhaps we can have some kind of reciprocity without this stultifying thing.

GROUP REPORTS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Norman Bernstein

Group 1 had an interesting discussion on many points. However, we formed only one recommendation relating to what may be the most important step to take in this area. I'll read it:

> WHEREAS it is commonly accepted that the minimum qualification for teaching in Canada should be a degree or equivalent, with a year of teacher education, it is recommended
>
> THAT each province recognize on a reciprocal basis the certification of persons with degree standing who hold permanent certificates.

Martin Murphy

Are there any questions that anyone would like to direct to Mr. Bernstein or members of his group concerning this recommendation?

J. I. Sheppy

By recognition does that mean that a certificate issued in, say, Quebec would be accepted in another province?

Bernstein

The idea being that any applicant who holds a university degree, a year of teacher training and a permanent certificate in Quebec would automatically be given a certificate in, say, Manitoba -- to teach in Manitoba. The endorsement on the certificate, the teaching assignment, is a distinct and separate matter, but the right to teach would be automatically given.

Sheppy

Would you recognize a certificate or would you want a statement from the other department of education? That is, would the receiving province want a statement making sure that this is a genuine certificate and so on?

Bernstein

We would assume that documentation would be forwarded specifying that this is a valid certificate and including proof of the university degree and the year of professional training.

Sheppy

What do you save if you still have to go back to the original place, if you still have to issue a certificate in the receiving province, if you still have to get information direct from the universities and the registrar of the other province and so on? Where is the "red tape" saved if you have to go through all this process?

Bernstein

By automatic recognition you cut out the lengthy process of evaluation for a limited number of applicants for certification.

Phillip Carter

It seems to me, and perhaps Mr. Mosher can comment, that it might be possible to go one step further and have the initial licence accompanied by a certificate from CTF which, when presented to any other province, would be all that would be necessary for recognition in that province.

R. D. Mosher

I notice, Mr. Bernstein, that you speak of a degree plus a year of teacher training, so you are excluding the integrated B.Ed. degree.

Bernstein

No. I mean a year of teacher training whether it is built into the degree in a B.Ed. program or taken consecutively.

Emerson Arnett

Mr. Lavery will be reporting for Group 2.

Robert Lavery

In Group 2 we did not see ourselves taking the same size leap as Group 1 apparently has suggested. We came up with some pretty mundane recommendations, three in all:

> 1. THAT CTF assist the provinces in the development of a more uniform system of teacher information and application.

What we did really was to look at Geraldine's paper of yesterday. On page 6 she has Phase 1, Unilateral Recognition, outlined and we bought that almost holus-bolus, with the exception of years of teacher experience.

> 2. THAT in the coming year our common efforts be aimed at the establishment of reciprocity at the degree level of four years of university education including professional courses above the secondary level.
>
> 3. THAT in the coming year CTF accumulate the information necessary to form the basis for this reciprocity and that the feasibility of translating certain basic qualifications into a Canadian Professional Certificate be studied at a similar conference next year.

We felt we did not have enough concrete information about all the provinces to recommend right now the implementation of a Canadian Professional Certificate. We thought the year could best be devoted to exploring the situation, because the adoption of such a certificate would have ramifications in a lot of other areas. It would be interesting, for example, to anticipate the possible impact of this policy on teacher education programs in the various provinces.

Carter

What kind of additional information were you seeking?

Lavery

Well, in the discussions in our group we felt that there are a whole lot of things that we still don't know about -- whether, for example, there is a commonality in teacher education programs at the degree level that warrants all of us having confidence in saying "These are in fact the same qualifications to teach."

Carter

Are you looking for sameness in teacher education?

Lavery

That's what I mean: that's what we have to decide eventually. We heard from New Brunswick, for example, that there were at least three different profiles in teacher education now. So what are you going to say about New Brunswick? Are you going to have three different descriptions or are only some of them going to be recognized by the other provinces?

Arnett

We were merely looking for a common base which would be a total of four years beyond secondary school. We weren't looking for a uniform program, but thought we might find that there are not such great differences among the things we are doing now. We would have more chance of making this thing work if through the aegis of CTF we did a little more exploring and ended up with a conference next year at which we sat down with this as a background. Maybe then we could actually come to a decision that would be a really workable one. A year of doing this would almost ensure that it came to pass.

L. P. Patterson

If I may comment on what you are saying, it seems to me very unfortunate if this motion should be interpreted as a crystallized definition of certification qualifications. I think it would be very unfortunate if any province felt that this were a level, that it could not go higher and set up higher, more stringent, more advanced qualifications for teaching. But at least we could agree with some minimum, the reason behind the minimum too, so that every province would feel that if a person comes to them with this minimum qualification, he is at least certified to teach within that province. That's what I was trying to get at. Reciprocity can go from there, but at least let's get certification at some level right across Canada.

R. D. Adams

This was our recommendation, that four years of training be the basic minimum level of acceptance in any province. Any province would have the prerogative of licensing their own people below that level, but those people would not be eligible to go to any other province. By doing this we would eliminate many of the loose strings which are still prevalent in all provinces. People licensed under former programs, these people are still with us, these people have performed a valuable service and they should be retained. But we are setting a future standard and 1976 seems to be the year in which it could be implemented.

J. E. Wicks

Mr. Chairman, Group 3 did not actually make a recommendation relating to reciprocity of certificates but we did have one recommendation which relates to the problem of mobility of teachers. I'll read exactly what we recorded:

> THAT there be a standard passport-type document, certified by the appropriate authority in the sending province, verifying the following items:

date of birth, marriage certificate if appropriate, citizenship, total years of teaching experience, university degrees, and teaching certificates held;

THAT this document be forwarded at the request of the migrating teacher by the sending authority to the receiving authority;

THAT the migrating teacher be given a copy of the document.

The rationale behind this is that, as Tom Rieger pointed out in an article a couple of years ago, one has to make ten declarations that he was born on this date, if he goes to the ten provinces. He has to change his religion twice and do things like that. All of this could really be recorded and stamped with an official seal of approval by the registrar of a department of education. That document could be sent to another department and then there would be no need to fish out the birth certificate and social insurance number and all that and go through the process again. So that was our recommendation that relates to mobility of teachers. We have one other recommendation, and then what we call an endorsement.

THAT CTF be requested to establish a clearinghouse service for information on teacher certification, salary classification, documentation, procedures, etc., for teachers moving within Canada and that a brochure be prepared for distribution in Canada and abroad, said brochure being updated annually.

And our last item, our endorsement, is that our group endorses the suggestion made earlier this morning:

THAT there be an annual conference convened by CTF on the theme of teacher certification, to which registrars and other appropriate non-CTF members be invited.

David Eaton

I don't want to get into the argument of the first recommendation -- we felt that if we are going to have reciprocity at all, we have got to start at some level. Surely this is one level where it could be started, where you could save on the bundle of paper that you accumulate on each teacher. If we start in this small way, maybe this could be a base from which we could look at other items affecting teacher certification and evaluation.

Carter

As a point of interest, we have a very strong Human Rights Council in Nova Scotia. They have made it almost impossible for the Department for any reason to ask almost anything. To ask about citizenship would contravene our Human Rights Act. We couldn't get a birth certificate giving place of birth. We couldn't ask for a certificate of moral character stipulating a person of divinity, and so on. No matter how innocuous the use might be, they are on us all the time not to identify much about a person. It's a wonder they let us ask if they have teacher training.

Adams

I should like to ask Mr. Wicks and his committee a question. They suggest that the basis of reciprocity is documentation. Do they agree to leave the basic minimum level up to the receiving province?

Wicks

This was not really discussed in our group, although we did at the beginning discuss the minimum requirement as being what we in DBS would call the Level 5, four years and a year of teacher training beyond Junior Matriculation. We considered this the most desirable point at which to begin reciprocity.

Stirling McDowell

On this question of reciprocity, I think perhaps one of the reasons that we have been talking about it for three decades or so, without one bit of progress, is that we have been hoping to see the whole thing happen all at once. I know it seems logical to pick some level and attack the problem that way. I am wondering, however, whether there might not be promise in the idea that you don't necessarily buy reciprocity all across the country all at once. I am thinking in particular of the reciprocal arrangements regarding teacher pensions, and I think the model is perhaps an apt one here, because of the complexity in both fields, because of the different kinds of provincial regulations. That started out with reciprocal arrangements among three provinces, then moved to four and perhaps five provinces. Might this not be a promising approach to the idea of reciprocity in teacher education? The other thing I think of is that probably one main reason for the lack of progress is that I don't think anyone or any group is really taking the initiative. And I'm wondering, in conjunction with the first point I mentioned, whether it might not be incumbent upon the registrar in a department of education particularly and upon the teachers' organization in a province particularly, to try and establish some initiative in this, reaching out into even one other province, to find some basis for a beginning of reciprocity.

Sheppy

On that very point I think I would have to say that in Alberta at least we do accept B.Ed. degrees without question. There is some kind of reciprocity here. If a B.Ed. comes from British Columbia, Saskatchewan, and so on, we don't examine this degree at all, we say this is a legitimate B.Ed. degree, this is acceptable.

A. H. Kingett

May I ask the gentleman who just spoke if that B.Ed., when it's recognized, places the person in the same category that he would be in in his own province?

Sheppy

Certificate-wise, yes. We do not deal with salaries. Another agency does that.

Kingett

So if he had a Certificate 5 in the province he came from, you would give hi[illegible] Certificate 5.

Sheppy

We do not have a Certificate 5. We have a Professional Certificate and we would issue that certificate.

Kingett

But for salary purposes you would put him back a step from where he was. Who decides that?

Sheppy

The ATA has a Qualifications Service that decides salary.

Kingett

Well regardless, I forget who made the statement yesterday, but he thought that most teachers were not that interested in reciprocal arrangements regarding salaries but were only interested in the certificate they were going to get. New Brunswickers must be quite different, or the people coming into New Brunswick, because sitting on the Board with Mr. Adams and others we find quite often that while they are interested in the certificate, they are much more interested in how much money they are going to get. It is fine to say that you give him the same recognition. But if when it

comes to salary you cut him back a step, I don't think you gain much in the way of reciprocal arrangements.

Arnett

What Stirling McDowell said has to be borne very strongly in mind. We cannot do the whole thing all at once, and no step is too small for a beginning.

W. Nowosad

Mr. Chairman, Group 4 didn't get around to dealing with the hard questions of reciprocity but we did set out certain objectives for certification -- in regard to teaching assignments, to certification for salary purposes and finally to the six points that are contained in the paper "Functions of Certification -- Quantity and Quality of Teachers." Perhaps I can deal with each of these areas. First, in the matter of certification, if a certificate or a licence to teach is nothing more than a formal recognition that an individual has met certain legal requirements for performing a professional service, then probably as an ultimate goal we should strive to have one basic teaching certificate which would be identical for all teachers, regardless of grade level or subject field. Now I don't know what the different steps would be in reaching that goal, but that was our decision and from there we went on to discussing the matter of assignments.

It was agreed that proper assignment as to grade level or subject field should be the responsibility of local school administrators and the individual teacher who is being assigned. What machinery and what procedures could be developed to guarantee appropriate assignment, we didn't spell out. But in any case, a certificate is there merely to regulate rather than to restrict. We did agree that placement of a teacher should be a local school system responsibility, provided that the teacher holds a licence to teach, and that the provincial authority should withdraw from issuing specialist endorsed restricted certificates. That is our recommendation in that area.

It might be interesting for this group to know that Mr. Witney, representing the CSTA, pointed out that part of the problem that besets the teaching profession is that you really have no clear terms of reference with respect to certification and I think, if I read him correctly, he was rather encouraging; he feels that the public is now ready to rely on the teaching profession to regulate its own standards by making its own policies and developing its own procedures. Am I right in that Mr. Witney?

Charles Witney

Yes.

Nowosad

From there we moved to classification for salary purposes and here we agreed that the matters of salary classification and certification should not be allied at all and that the grant structure does not really have that much to do with certification. It was pointed out that the trend should be towards local autonomy in salary classification, but on the other hand there is evidence, as was pointed out by Stirling McDowell of Saskatchewan, that in his province there is a great deal of centralization going on and perhaps this is going to become difficult because the grant structure is tied in with the level of certificate. It should be possible to separate certification procedures from salary procedures. This will become possible if certification is defined in a narrower sense than it has been heretofore. Perhaps what we need is some common terminology across Canada. It was generally favoured that separation of certification from salary classification is desirable because the right to teach is not open to negotiation.

Where does the responsibility for evaluation of salary lie? Well, we reviewed some of the procedures of the various provinces. In Alberta it is done by an independent board where decision is final. In Ontario, it is exclusively the right of the teachers. British Columbia has set up a salary categorization board which is a joint board of the teachers and trustees. It was felt that teachers' organizations have a primary responsibility in this area, but that other agencies, such as trustees, may be involved.

We then dealt with the problems of the six questions posed in the paper "Quantity and Quality of Teachers." Question number one was, "Should teacher associations adopt and push for a definite timetable for raising the minimum requirement for entering teaching to degree level?" Our group thought yes, we should, although we did not set any definite time limit. Some provinces have already set out objectives for themselves in terms of time but as Dr. McDowell again here pointed out, the introduction of paraprofessionals and other economic factors are operating here and you get what is called a sieve effect, where perhaps there will be fewer highly-qualified teachers supported by a battery of non-professionals. This is something that we have to watch very carefully. On the other hand, it was also pointed out that when you raise standards in the teaching profession, you attract better people and more people.

We spent a great deal of time on the matter of teacher aides -- that's question number three. We did agree that membership of some kind should be available to the paraprofessionals, although again, Mr. Witney pointed out that in his experience in the government, he found that paraprofessionals tend to crystallize into their own organizations and then ask for special recognition through legislation. And this could well happen with paraprofessionals if we allow them to form their own unions or organizations,

for example the CUPE kind of thing. Probably it would be better to have these people inside rather than outside the group. On the other hand, Mr. Archer made the observation that if we allow them to come in and become members of the profession, then the distinction is very hard to draw. He said, if they subscribe to the same by-laws, regulations and ethics, then of course they have to behave the same way as teachers do, and then they are no longer paraprofessionals. On this point we were something like the old-time politician who said, "Some of my friends think we should raise taxes and some of my friends say that we shouldn't and where do I stand on the issue, well, I agree." We didn't really come to any hard solid conclusions here but some sort of affiliate status for paraprofessionals certainly should be considered.

In regard to question number four, we saw no essential difference between social workers, librarians and paraprofessionals. With regard to question number five, we felt that unless we resolve questions numbers 3 and 4, the definition called for in number 5 may be almost impossible. You know, if you give them legal differentiation, or if you establish legal differentiation, then you automatically crystallize their position.

Quite frankly, we didn't understand question number 6, dealing with provincial registries. We also discussed whether there should be yearly meetings. Yes there should, but only if the objectives of these meetings are clearly defined. And British Columbia has a reservation about sending its departmental officials to Quebec. As long as the meeting isn't held in the province of Quebec, this would be quite agreeable.

Finally, with regard to the clearinghouse function of CTF, it was agreed that CTF has performed a very useful function, especially in the kind of paper that Miss Channon drew up, because it tried to draw together the trends and posed some very pertinent questions. And, of course, CTF always is here and reacts to the requests of the affiliates.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the report of group 4, except for one last final item, reciprocity. We did have one word on it and that is that the only real way that we will get reciprocity is for the responsibility for certification to devolve on teachers' organizations.

J. W. Killeen

I think sometimes, Mr. Chairman, that we try and work some of these things too quickly. We try and adopt the idea that reciprocity has to be a good thing. Someone yesterday expressed reservations in this area. Stirling McDowell also suggested the need for a pretty careful examination. This reminded our group of the process of gradualism through which change is effected and brought

to mind the story about the application of gradualism in the once British colony of Kenya. They just couldn't break away from this tradition of gradualism. They did a very interesting study a couple of years ago, which dealt with traffic patterns, and they decided that as of January 1, 1971, traffic would be changed from the left-hand side of the road to the right. There was a very thorough survey, they involved car manufacturers, did all the right things, and they finally came up with some legislation, to be effective January 1, 1971. All this was very fine, and they had further debate, and then finally, conceding the best British traditions of gradualism, they decided that on that date the new legislation would apply to commercial vehicles only.

Therein hangs a bit of a moral in that I have a feeling that many of us have grabbed this term "reciprocity", interpreted it as meaning what we want it to mean, and then endorsed it like "motherhood". Some of our group happen to be against motherhood, both in its original sense and in the sense of reciprocity. By group I don't necessarily mean our discussion group. I would hope that we have said some of the things that are in the backs of our minds. I have the feeling that a lot of people endorsed Mr. Couch's comments and endorsed the basic principle of reciprocity with all kinds of reservations that haven't been brought out during the past day and a half. Now that may be an element of suspicion, but I think we would do well to consider whether or not we have given a motherhood kind of endorsement, while really in our own minds we have reservations.

Murphy

Thank you, Mr. Killeen.

Witney

I would just like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I'm quite new at this business of education and that my views, expressed to you earlier, were really the views of myself. It would be unfair to your association and to my own if it were taken that I was expressing the position of CSTA. I have been travelling the country talking to teachers, trustees, ministers and deputy ministers and those views are the views that I have begun to form in my mind as I travelled from coast to coast. They are the type of views that I will be presenting to the CSTA. You have been very kind to invite us here, and we appreciate the invitation, but I just did not want to be unfair to you.

A. Sutton

I understand that when I made my statement yesterday about the basic right to teach in the province being the first concern

of teachers I aroused some concern. I gave that as a personal point of view. I was interested in the last gentleman's comments about reservations about reciprocity -- I still feel that reciprocity is the basic right to teach in the province, and I am wondering whether a study or survey has been made of teacher education programs throughout Canada; for example, speaking from a provincial point of view in Ontario, are teacher education programs for elementary teachers distinct from those for secondary school teachers? This is not true of all provinces and this in itself causes one stumbling block towards reciprocity.

I was very interested in the comments from British Columbia, to the effect that incoming teachers receive an evaluation no more and no less favourable than that given teachers trained in British Columbia. Speaking purely from a provincial point of view, in Ontario we at the department have the view that the education, academic and professional, must be the equivalent of that of a person who has received his education in Ontario. It is our basic premise. Because we have behind us the teachers' federation who, if we grant licences to teach in Ontario to persons who have received less training than is required in Ontario, would question it and rightly so too. So that we are working together in that sense. We try to work together and to regard each other's interests.

If people are asking where information may be obtained, we have a pamphlet called "Be a Teacher in Ontario," which we would be very glad to send to anyone. It has the address of the OSSTF and the Ontario Teachers' Federation. We also have a publication called "Horizons" which gives information about the educational programs. If any of you do not receive these pamphlets, we would be most happy to send them to you.

Personally, I am always concerned when we have to say no to a person. As a private individual I favour reciprocity. I know that we in Ontario, because of our thirteen grades, do create difficulties. And I am gathering from the discussion that the way we interpret degrees, the way we interpret bachelor's degrees, in one case the bachelor of education and science degree . . . . Where the bachelor's degree is used, some people in some provinces have more specific degrees than ours. As it stands for us, the high school assistant's course is an academic course, not necessarily an academic bachelor of arts degree, but enough academic content in it to match what is required of a teacher in Ontario. If I, as a graduate from a university in Ontario, or a graduate of New Brunswick or British Columbia, if I wanted to get secondary school teacher training, I would have to go to the colleges of education and they, as universities, make the sole decision about the acceptability of the applicants. I don't know what David would like to add to that point of view, but I just wish to make that statement. As far as salaries are concerned, they vary throughout Ontario.

Murphy

Thank you, Mr. Sutton.

Bernstein

What is the status of the recommendations coming from the various groups?

Murphy

We hope that there will be action on everyone's part. Certainly we at CTF will do our share to encourage our Members to do their share in implementing any of the recommendations involving them.

Geraldine Channon

Any recommendations involving CTF would be brought before the Board of Directors.

Bernstein

There is a procedural problem here -- how do the recommendations get to the Board?

Norman Goble

May I offer a suggestion on that? I think it would be convenient if these recommendations were tested by a vote by those here. Not that we have asked people to come as accredited delegates with formal voting rights, but so that we may see which resolutions do command general support. Those resolutions which do get majority support here would then become part of the official report of this conference. As such they would be examined by our Board of Directors and, as Miss Channon has said, those which call for action by CTF would be treated in that sense as suggestions for action by CTF and acted upon, if our AGM reacts favourably to them. The conference report would in its turn become a document for whatever future meeting is held, since you talk about periodic meetings like this, perhaps annual. If an annual meeting does take place the report of this meeting, with its resolutions, becomes a document for next year and gives a very interesting starting point. If you look at the 1970 resolutions that you pass here, you will be interested in your reports on how far you have gone towards implementation. Perhaps that in itself would be a useful pacing of progress. I don't see any formal procedure for making faster progress on implementation where the decision rests with the separate jurisdictions. I think there one can only use moral suasion in regard to the resolutions.

Arnett

Will the report of this conference go to all delegates?

Goble

Yes.

Arnett

Then in this way the resolutions will get to all jurisdictions.

Goble

The report, however, will not have very wide distribution.

Murphy

Well, then, perhaps we could take Mr. Bernstein's suggestion here regarding a vote to record consensus. We might go back to Group 1 and start with their recommendation.

Bernstein

Our recommendation was as follows:

> WHEREAS it is commonly accepted that the minimum qualification for teaching in Canada should be a degree or equivalent, with a year of teacher education, it is recommended
>
> THAT each province recognize, on a reciprocal basis, the certification of persons with degree standing who hold permanent certificates.

Tom Rieger

I was in the same group. I just want to add another word or two of explanation as to what this means. In the first place, it is understood that the province that issues the certificate has recognized the degree, besides its being a degree from an AUCC institution. Also, this recommendation does not say anything about the kind of certificate that is granted in the receiving province. All it says is that it will entitle a person to some kind of certificate; the grade level and subject placement are up to the receiving province.

Murphy

May we have the vote on Mr. Bernstein's recommendation now? Thank you. The motion has been carried. Now perhaps we may have again the recommendations from Group 2.

Lavery

You are going to find some redundancy in these, but I suppose that is beside the point. Our first recommendation was that CTF assist the provinces in the development of a more uniform system of teacher information and application as suggested by Geraldine Channon in her paper yesterday. This recommendation was better put, I thought, by Group 3. Perhaps you should vote on their recommendation instead.

Our second recommendation was:

> THAT in the coming year our common efforts be aimed at the establishment of reciprocity at the degree level of four years of university education including professional courses above the secondary level.

This sounds to me something like the recommendation from Mr. Bernstein's group on which we have already expressed ourselves this morning, so probably we don't need another vote.

Our third recommendation was:

> THAT in the coming year CTF accumulate the information necessary to form the basis for this reciprocity and that the feasibility of translating certain basic qualifications into a Canadian Professional Certificate be studied at a similar conference next year.

Murphy

Would you care to vote on this last resolution? Thank you. I declare the motion carried.

May we have the recommendations from Group 3 now.

Wicks

Our first recommendation was:

> THAT there be a standard passport-type document, certified by the appropriate authority in the sending province, verifying the following items: date of birth, marriage certificate if appropriate, citizenship, total years of teaching experience, university degrees, and teaching certificates held;

THAT this document be forwarded at the request of the migrating teacher by the sending authority to the receiving authority;

THAT the migrating teacher be given a copy of the document.

Lavery

Where that seems to be different from our first one is that we kind of wanted CTF to assume the initiative in helping the various provinces to prepare such a system.

C. F. Furey

We have a similar document in use in the Atlantic provinces -- all four of us.

Patterson

I intend to vote against this. I don't think it's the important point. Let's leave some dissatisfied customers around so that they will exert pressure on CTF to exert pressure on other duly constituted bodies and get some action.

Murphy

Could we have a show of hands on this recommendation?

Carter

First, I would like to ask if we are really voting for the idea of CTF itself looking at all the documents and coming up with a proposal, or are we voting on those specific pieces of information that you recommended?

Wicks

We listed the items that came to mind that are required of a person who goes from one province to another. Now there is no real need that a teacher leaving Nova Scotia with a valid certificate should have to produce a birth certificate when he goes into another province if the registrar stamped the document . . .

Carter

So what you're really asking for . . .

Wicks

. . . is the idea . . .

Carter

Also coming up with a document which could be transmitted across the country.

Murphy

May we vote now? I declare the motion carried.

Arnett

Did this motion include the idea of CTF taking the initiative, or just the proposal as put by Mr. Wicks?

Murphy

Just the latter. Perhaps Mr. Lavery would like to incorporate the suggestion that CTF take the initiative and see that this was done.

Lavery

All you want is direction, so why not use ours as it was and put it together with the other one. Do you want to vote on it?

Murphy

Let's vote on Mr. Lavery's recommendation right now. Would you repeat it please?

Lavery

> THAT CTF assist the provinces in the development of a more uniform system of teacher information and application.

Murphy

The motion has been carried.

Patterson

I rise to a point of order. You did not call for those voting against. I don't mind being alone.

Murphy

We were looking for a consensus, Dr. Patterson.

Wicks

Our second recommendation was as follows:

> THAT CTF be requested to establish a clearing-house service for information on teacher certification, salary classification, documentation, procedures, etc., for teachers moving within Canada and that a brochure be prepared for distribution in Canada and abroad, said brochure being updated annually.

Unidentified

How expensive and how big a job is this?

Murphy

Mr. Goble, would you care to reply?

Goble

Not impossibly big and expensive. I think that is the best answer I can give. As to the point of production, I would have to consult Miss Channon, having already answered for her.

Channon

I don't think it is an impossible task, provided that the information is given in the form in which it is requested.

Goble

And since we are presumably speaking of something done in the briefest possible summary form, as brief as can be useful and coherent. I don't think the costs of production ought to make it an impossible task.

Sutton

I would like to speak to that because departmental certification is the responsibility of each province and I feel that there are changes within a year, within a given month, and that it would be misleading to give out information once a year. Because certificates are issued by each particular province, I think a person could write the province for this information as long as initial certification remains the responsibility of the individual province.

I don't know if other people have been faced with this problem of having people come to their particular province, having received information in other parts of the world that there are many

vacancies. They come thinking they can qualify as teachers in Canada, but find they have been under a misapprehension.

Wicks

That was the rationale behind the suggestion in the first place, that there are so many demands for this information. And sometimes they are not for information about a specific province. Where I work we get numerous requests from people inside and outside Canada asking about the qualifications required of teachers and sometimes, of course, even asking us for jobs. DBS really has nothing to send out to them, since we are mainly a statistical agency. We would certainly be delighted to have the Canadian Teachers' Federation undertake this task.

Bernstein

It is understood that policies and regulations change periodically and this information would have to state "as of a given date."

Wilson

My objection is that publications are obsolete as soon as they are printed, and I think CTF would be sticking its neck out if it assumed the printing of what appeared to be an authoritative document when in essence the provinces have the prerogative for issuing certificates. CTF is not in a position to have any province fulfil what it says. I think this is a rather risky service to provide.

Murphy

Would you read your recommendation again, Mr. Wicks?

Wicks

> THAT CTF be requested to establish a clearinghouse service for information on teacher certification, salary classification, documentation, procedures, etc., for teachers moving within Canada and that a brochure be prepared for distribution in Canada and abroad, said brochure being updated annually.

Kingett

I wonder if we might break that into two parts and vote on each section. There were two items here. One is that they maintain a clearinghouse and the other that they prepare a brochure.

Murphy

Let's vote on the first part, regarding a clearinghouse.

McDowell

Mr. Chairman, maybe I don't understand the nature of this double-barrelled proposition, but I don't see the point in maintaining a clearinghouse if the Federation is then not going to give out any of the information, through publication or whatever.

Arnett

The department has information, but it doesn't necessarily have a brochure that covers it all. I share some of the fears expressed by others. This might be the particular straw that broke the camel's back and I'd rather see us try the clearing service for a year and see if it works.

McDowell

What is the clearing service?

Arnett

Well, the teacher can write in to CTF and ask for information.

McDowell

And is CTF going to give them some information?

Arnett

Well, specific information. CTF couldn't give information on every possible situation in Canada in order to answer my question on the particular situation in Ontario.

Channon

If we get a request for specific information on Ontario we send the request to Ontario.

McDowell

If somebody wants to know what's the situation in Canada, why not send him a letter and a brochure? Certainly the most obvious thing to do is to have an introductory statement saying that this was printed in, say, March 1970 or wherever it was and that regulations may have been changed since that date. I just can't see the hangup, that's all.

Brennan

Just Canadian caution.

Murphy

Miss Channon . . .

Channon

Perhaps there is some kind of misunderstanding about what would be contained in this brochure. It would not include detailed rulings regarding every possible credential that might be presented for evaluation. I think the brochure would simply consolidate and verify, for example, the documents which need to be submitted to each province, and the agencies concerned in evaluation. It might perhaps also point out some difficulties frequently encountered. I don't think that kind of information would go out of date every month. I would just note that we have looked at several lists of documentation required, prepared by different agencies, and find that the lists do not correspond.

Arthur Kratzmann

I'm from British Columbia. I would just second this. I'm sure the committee felt there would be material in here such as addresses, pertinent sequences by which you present the material, any appropriate fees, and an overview or capsule of the general procedures, with a note, of course, that these may not apply at any other date than the one published and that further information may be secured from X, Y and Z.

Murphy

Let's now vote on the second part. The motion has been carried.

Unidentified

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wilson would vote for it if you put a big red stamp on the front that said "Out of Date."

Wicks

Our third recommendation was:

> THAT an annual conference be held, convened by CTF, on the theme of teacher certification, to which teachers, registrars and other appropriate non-CTF members be invited.

Unidentified

This occurs in one of the other groups, as I recall. They had a little rider at the end, that there would be a meeting next year if there was a definite agenda or need, but don't make it annual by statute.

Lavery

Mr. Chairman, that was resolution number three from Group 2.

Patterson

This may be an appropriate time to ask what is going to happen to some of these things that have been started here today? I would hope that CTF would take action on the things that have been placed before it today and would ask such organizations as the Council of Ministers, the Canadian Education Association and the Canadian School Trustees' Association for support for this sort of thing. And I would hope that this annual meeting would be an opportunity to report progress or to report difficulties, and give it a real basis for future action. There's no use coming to meetings like this and passing pious resolutions if nothing is done about them. I want to see that some action is taken, at least to identify where the difficulties are. If that is the purpose, I am all for it.

Murphy

I think Mr. Goble commented on that earlier, as far as action by CTF is concerned.

Goble

Dr. Patterson's points are well taken and have been noted.

Murphy

Are you satisfied that the third recommendation of Mr. Wick's report, that an annual meeting be held, has been covered in a previous recommendation? Thank you. Now Group 4, may we have your recommendations?

Nowosad

Mr. Chairman, we had only the one formal recommendation. If this has any direct bearing on reciprocity, here it is:

> THAT placement of a teacher be a local school system responsibility provided that the teacher holds a provincial licence to teach and

THAT the provincial authority withdraw from issuing special endorsed restrictive certificates.

Bernstein

There seem to be two recommendations, one on the placement of teachers and the other on endorsed certificates. I think I must speak against the first one, in that in some provinces, notably Quebec, the process of assignment and placement is a topic of collective negotiation and we feel rather strongly that teachers must get involved directly in the assigning and placing of teachers. It should not be left strictly up to the administrators.

Murphy

Mr. Nowosad, would you break up your motion into two parts and let us deal with one first. The first one, please, on the question of placement.

Nowosad

THAT placement of a teacher be a local school system responsibility provided that the teacher holds a provincial licence to teach.

McDowell

Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest in response to Mr. Bernstein that the intention in this was not to preclude the kind of thing you have in mind, but rather to identify the level, mainly provincial or local, at which placement would be made.

Bernstein

Another problem is that in several provinces salary classification is made at the provincial level. Is this an attempt to fight that idea?

McDowell

It doesn't deal with the idea of salary categories at all.

Bernstein

It's strictly teacher placement as such?

McDowell

Right.

Murphy

Well then, perhaps we can deal with the whole motion as one. Mr. Nowosad would you read the whole motion again.

Nowosad

Again?

> THAT placement of a teacher be a local school system responsibility provided that the teacher holds a provincial licence to teach and
>
> THAT the provincial authorities withdraw from issuing specialist endorsed restricted teaching certificates.

Carter

I don't agree that you can put them back together. I hold a particular opinion on the second part. I don't see any objection in principle to the first part; at least I don't have any objection to other people thinking that assignments should be made at the local level. But I do have objections, if I understand the second part of the motion, to the idea that we withdraw from increasing specialization in teacher education. I think the whole trend everywhere is towards that.

Bernstein

My objection to the first part of the motion has been dissolved.

Nowosad

I have no objection to separating them.

Murphy

Very well then, let's deal with the first part of the recommendation now.

Sheppy

As a member of this group, our feeling was that the second part really explains the first part. In other words, if this business of teacher placement, including subject matter and grade placement, is to be resolved at the local level, then the provincial authority cannot continue strictly regulating assignments itself. Thus the two parts really are the same resolution, and the second part explains the first. With regard to specialization there is

no thought of reducing this, because this is an increasing sort of thing. The idea was that the specialization would be demonstrated in university transcripts or diplomas of various sorts which the local authorities, that is to say, the superintendent, the teachers, and the board too, should be able to interpret to the point where they can say that this person is specialized in this field, without having the provincial authorities say that this person must teach only this subject. So we thought the two parts of the resolution were interdependent. However, if you wish to treat the two separately that's all right.

Murphy

Let's have the first part of the recommendation then. That part is carried. May we have the second part of your recommendation, Mr. Nowosad.

Nowosad

> THAT the provincial authorities withdraw from issuing specialist endorsed restricted teaching certificates.

Eaton

May I ask for clarification on that. Do you mean that the training would go too? If they do not issue certificates, would the training also not be there? I am concerned, for example, that a Guidance Specialist certificate in Ontario, which takes four summers, and for which the department gives a special certificate . . .

Nowosad

I believe Mr. Sheppy has explained this.

Eaton

I would be concerned about this. I agree with the first part, that the local authorities should be able to say whether the guidance specialist has to teach 50 per cent, 40 per cent, 20 per cent or nothing. But I still feel rather strongly that I would like to have this certificate specialization named and alive.

Rieger

I wanted to ask about the word restricted. Is this restricted as to grade level and subject or restricted as to time?

Tom Jackson

I should like some further clarification on this as to just what is meant by classification -- are we thinking that the certification authorities shouldn't get into the business of saying this is a history teacher, or a French teacher, or something else, or are we wiping out all classifications whatever? For example, in some provinces we have general subjects, meaning generally academic subjects, but we also have endorsements and special certificates in certain fields, for instance physical education, home economics, and so on, which seem to be accepted. Are there to be no classifications whatsoever, but merely a teaching certificate?

J. C. Struthers

I would have to speak against this. We have in Saskatchewan specialized certificates, notably the vocational certificate, and I fail to see how a teacher who goes through the process of obtaining that certificate, considering the training program that he gets, I fail to see how that could possibly equip him to teach generally. And it seems to me that if you don't restrict his field on the certificate itself there is a chance that this person could be hopelessly misplaced. I think we still have to have some special certificates.

Jackson

That is exactly the clarification I am asking for.

Murphy

Could someone from the committee answer Mr. Jackson?

Sheppy

I think what has been said by Mr. Struthers is that a registrar is a better judge of the teacher's placement than is the superintendent and the local staff, and that they must be guided by a registrar or someone in the provincial authority. The purpose of our motion is to say that at the local level we have people just as competent to judge in this matter. In other words, our systems are mature enough at the local level to do just as well as or better than a somewhat remote provincial authority.

Moffat

I am listening to this with somewhat mixed feelings, and I am prepared to accept the idea of removing all restrictions on teaching assignments, grade levels, subject-wise, the whole thing, when a teacher has obtained the minimum desired level of certification -- a degree plus a year of teacher training. Below that level

I would like to retain -- I could probably be talked out of this -- but I think I would like to retain the special certificate. The reason I would accept it at the higher level -- the degree level -- and I don't care if it is a degree in music, or industrial arts, or any other area that you would like to name, is that a teacher who has attained that level of standing has attained a degree of professionalism. I do believe that the local authorities -- the superintendents -- could very well place teachers properly. I would be quite in favour of the provincial government withdrawing from issuing special certificates at the degree level. I think I would, at this point anyway, feel that I would like to retain them at the lower level.

Adams

Mr. Sheppy's remarks warrant a great deal of study, if in fact local authorities are doing this. We in New Brunswick have of course recommended this, but we know that it in fact is not happening, to a large degree, so endorsement really becomes a service, rather than a restriction. We have been discussing for two days the great deal of red tape, and we are attempting now to get rid of some of this red tape. Some of us have gone so far as to say that we should have reciprocity without even requiring official transcripts in the receiving province. So really endorsement is a service more than a restriction. Final assignment still does rest with local authority -- we have just voted on this, that we are endorsing this. So if you eliminate endorsement, it would seem to me that you are asking for more red tape.

Moffat

If I may repeat this again, Mr. Adams' statement is one that appeals to us fairly strongly. We have discussed the advisability of endorsing certificates at all levels without limiting the right to teach to the endorsement. That would be a service in that case, as Mr. Adams has suggested. It seems it might be a worthwhile service to an employing board to have this endorsement, but not limit the right to teach to the subject areas shown in the endorsement.

Rieger

Perhaps what I am going to say really isn't pertinent to the recommendation but there is another aspect to this, that there should be some responsibility on teachers about seeking jobs for which they are not qualified. Perhaps the code of ethics of teachers should have a clause that it is unethical to seek a job for which they are not qualified, and on the other hand, the teacher should have a right to protest an assignment that he is not qualified to take or that he doesn't want to take.

Murphy

May we take a vote on this recommendation then? The motion has been defeated.

In closing the meeting I would like to thank those who have prepared papers and delivered them, particularly Messrs. Eaton, Adams and Couch, indeed all the Teacher Education and Certification Committee, Miss Channon, Mr. Rieger and Mr. Mosher as well. Our President opened the meeting with words of greeting. He has come back from Ottawa this morning and I would ask him now to close the meeting.

Goble

I would just like to ask one question about the records of the meeting. The last resolution was disapproved of -- I am picking words carefully -- by the majority. Would it be appropriate if that were simply not included in the records, rather than shown as having been defeated, because it may be that what most people would really like would be that it be referred for further study and perhaps evolved into something a little different. So it might be a pity if it went on record as having been presented and defeated as if the whole principle were opposed. Would this meet the wishes of all people here if this recommendation, then, rather than being recorded as presented and defeated, were just omitted?

Murphy

How many would agree with that?

Arnett

Mr. Chairman, I would like to object, on a matter of principle. If we are going to have a record of this conference, I think we should have a record of this conference.

Goble

I did not really mean that it be entirely stricken from the records, but I wouldn't want it to appear rejected when perhaps it was simply not accepted. Mr. Arnett's point might be met then if we recorded that it was not accepted at this time. I am at the will of the meeting. Do you want it shown as defeated, or do you want it shown that it was set aside for further study?

Welbourne

Mr. Chairman, could we not record that the group was divided on this question?

Arnett

I will be happy if it is simply recorded that on some of the matters there was consensus, but on this opinion was divided.

Sutton

May I make a positive question towards reciprocity. The teacher education program varies in the number of hours, the number of months, the various summer courses, etc., throughout Canada. Would it be possible for the "in" province to make a statement to the effect that "I consider that this person has the equivalent of one year of teacher education within this province" without counting up hours, summer courses and so on, for our particular purpose, as a real positive step toward reciprocity?

Murphy

The best we can do is to take note of your recommendation. I would ask the secretary to take note of your suggestion.

Sutton

I have raised the question toward reciprocity -- is it possible to work towards reciprocity by asking the provincial authorities to say that as regards teacher education, this person in his own province has the equivalent of a full year of teacher education? I could quote examples of some people having summer courses in Ontario who may not be accepted outside because of the requirements there. I think that this would be a very positive step, rather than counting the number of hours and courses, and the number of weeks, etc. We are faced with this question repeatedly.

Brennan

Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that there are some ladies present, I hesitate to have the last word, because that is their prerogative normally, but I am always subject to the chairman and he has directed me to have the last word.

Since being associated with CTF this question of teacher certification has come up very frequently and each time, if my memory serves me correct, what we have really done is we have found that we have opened up a "can of worms" and the tendency has always in the past been to put it back in the cupboard again hoping that sometime in the future the can of worms will disappear. But problems are not in the habit of solving themselves and I think we have taken a little more realistic approach to them at this meeting. They say the longest journey has to begin with the first step. If we concentrate too much on the length of the journey, we never make the first step. I think, as a result of the conference,

and I have not been here for all of it, we have made a very determined effort to take that first step. CTF will be happy to play the role of coordinator for this particular job in so far as our resources -- personnel and financial resources -- will allow. We look on that as one of the functions of CTF.

In paying tribute to Martin Murphy and his committee for the conduct of this meeting, I think they would agree and I am sure you would too, that we should pay special tribute to the major job that was done by Geraldine Channon. Her two papers made a big contribution to this conference. In saying that, of course, I am not minimizing the importance of the contribution made by the other gentlemen who presented papers yesterday, but I think you will all agree that Geraldine's contribution has been quite an excellent one. She has a happy knack, as we all know from past experience, of course, of taking a very complicated issue and presenting it in a very concise, very clear way so that the problems don't seem as imposing as they did at the beginning, and I think you would all want me to make special reference to her contribution at this meeting.

I would like to reiterate again the welcome and the appreciation that I made at the beginning to the people from the departments of education across the country for their participation in this meeting. In Canada, of course, the problems in education at the national level are always great ones and we have always had difficulties in trying to do anything at the national level if it concerns education. And yet we know, while respecting the provincial rights in education, which is the policy that CTF has, that there are issues that deserve consideration at the national level and this is one of them. Bringing a little more order and clarity into teacher certification, to bring about the possibility of greater mobility of teachers across the country, is a desirable aim and does not in any way interfere with provincial autonomy. I think we have made a contribution towards that and hope as a result of the follow-ups that will come from this meeting that we will take that necessary first step toward solving quite a complicated problem.

I think that is about all I have to say. I want to thank you all again and wish you all bon voyage.

A P P E N D I X 1

THE PROGRAM

CANADIAN TEACHERS' FEDERATION

SECOND CONFERENCE ON TEACHER CERTIFICATION

"Current Problems in Certification and
Prospects for Reciprocity"

Chairman: Mr. Martin P. Murphy (Chairman,
CTF Committee on Teacher Education
and Certification)

Monday and Tuesday, June 8-9, 1970

H O L I D A Y I N N

420 Sherbrooke Street West
Montreal 132, Quebec

Monday -- June 8

The Functional Approach to Teacher Certification

8:30 a.m. Registration

9:00 a.m. Welcome

Brother A. F. Brennan, President,
Canadian Teachers' Federation

9:15 a.m. Opening Statements

Introduction	--	Mr. Martin Murphy, Chairman, CTF Teacher Education and Certification Committee
Quantity and Quality of Teachers	--	Miss Geraldine Channon, Coordinator, CTF Teacher Education Project
Salary Classification	--	Mr. Tom Rieger, Executive Assistant, The Alberta Teachers' Association
Teaching Assignments	--	Mr. R. Mosher, Deputy Secretary General Canadian Teachers' Federation

10:15 a.m. Question Period

10:30 a.m. Coffee break

10:45 a.m. Group Discussion

12:15 p.m. End of morning session

2:00 p.m. Group Discussion (continued)

3:45 p.m. Coffee break

4:00 p.m. Plenary Session -- reports of group discussions

Tuesday -- June 9

The Road to Reciprocity

9:00 a.m. Paper -- "Some First Steps Toward Reciprocity"
Miss Geraldine Channon, Coordinator,
CTF Teacher Education Project

9:30 a.m. Response re Feasibility

Mr. David M. Eaton, Assistant Secretary,
Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation
(Certification Board, OSSTF)

Mr. E. A. Couch, Evaluator,
Teacher Qualification Service (British Columbia)

9:50 a.m. Recent Progress in the Atlantic Provinces

Mr. R. D. Adams, Registrar,
New Brunswick Department of Education

10:10 a.m. General Discussion

10:30 a.m. Coffee break

10:45 a.m. Group Discussion

12:00 noon Plenary Session -- recommendations for action

12:30 p.m. End of morning session

2:00 p.m. Plenary Session -- discussion of recommendations

3:00 p.m. Adjournment

A P P E N D I X 2

LIST OF PERSONS ATTENDING

ADAMS, Mr. R. D.,
Registrar,
N.B. Department of Education,
Centennial Building,
Fredericton, N.B.

ARCHER, Mr. Bruce,
Administrative Assistant,
Ontario Teachers' Federation,
1260 Bay Street,
Toronto 185, Ont.

ARNETT, Mr. Emerson,
General Secretary,
Manitoba Teachers' Society,
191 Harcourt St.,
Winnipeg, Man.

BERNSTEIN, Mr. Norman, Chairman,
Teacher Education and Certification Committee,
Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers of Quebec,
4450 Marcil Avenue,
Montreal 260, Que.

BRADY, Miss Doreen,
Apt. 518, 840 Springland Drive,
Ottawa 8, Ont.

BRENNAN, Brother A. F.,
President,
Canadian Teachers' Federation,
320 Queen Street, Suite 2010,
Ottawa 4, Ont.

CARTER, Dr. R. Phillip,
Director of Teacher Education,
N.S. Department of Education,
Box 1060, Armdale,
Halifax, N.S.

CHANNON, Miss Geraldine, Coordinator,
Teacher Education Project,
Canadian Teachers' Federation,
320 Queen Street, Suite 2010,
Ottawa 4, Ont.

COUCH, Mr. E. A.,
Evaluator,
Teacher Qualification Service,
Apt. 220, 1070 West Broadway,
Vancouver, B.C.

EATON, Mr. David M.,
Assistant Secretary,
Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation,
1260 Bay Street,
Toronto 185, Ont.

FUREY, Mr. C. F.,
Registrar,
Newfoundland Department of Education,
Confederation Building,
St. John's, Nfld.

GOBLE, Mr. Norman,
Secretary-General,
Canadian Teachers' Federation,
320 Queen Street, Suite 2010,
Ottawa 4, Ont.

HODGSON, Miss Elizabeth,
Executive Assistant,
Federation of Women Teachers' Associations of Ontario,
1260 Bay Street,
Toronto 185, Ont.

JACKSON, Mr. Tom,
Educational Specialist,
Quebec Department of Education,
917 Mgr. Grandin,
St. Foye, Quebec 10, P.Q.

KILLEEN, Mr. J. W.,
President,
British Columbia Teachers' Federation,
105 - 2235 Burrard St.,
Vancouver 180, B.C.

KINGETT, Mr. A. H.,
Executive Director,
New Brunswick Teachers' Association,
P. O. Box 752,
Fredericton, N.B.

KRATZMANN, Dr. Arthur,
Chairman,
Teacher Qualification Board,
Director of Student Teaching,
University of Victoria,
Victoria, B.C.

LAVERY, Mr. Robert,
Assistant Director,
St. Joseph Teachers' College,
3465 Durocher St.,
Montreal, Que.

LYND, Mr. D. J.,
Assistant Chief,
Teacher Information Section,
Dominion Bureau of Statistics,
No. 5 Temporary Building,
Ottawa 3, Ont.

MACDONALD, Mr. Reginald,
Registrar,
P.E.I. Department of Education,
Provincial Buildings,
Charlottetown, P.E.I.

MCDOWELL, Dr. Stirling,
General Secretary,
Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation,
P. O. Box 1108,
Saskatoon, Sask.

MOFFAT, Mr. H. P.,
Director of Teacher Certification,
Manitoba Department of Education,
1181 Portage Avenue,
Winnipeg 10, Man.

MORRISON, Mr. Ronald J.,
Executive Assistant,
Nova Scotia Teachers Union,
P. O. Box 1060, Armdale,
Halifax, N.S.

MOSHER, Mr. R. D.,
Deputy Secretary General,
Canadian Teachers' Federation,
320 Queen St. Suite 2010,
Ottawa 4, Ont.

MURPHY, Mr. Martin P., Chairman,
CTF Teacher Education and
Certification Committee,
18 Salisbury Road,
Pointe Claire, Que.

NOWOSAD, Mr. W.,
Second Vice-President,
Manitoba Teachers' Society,
90 Crowson Bay,
Winnipeg 19, Man.

PATTERSON, Dr. L P.,
Canadian School Trustees' Association,
4710 Connaught Avenue,
Montreal 262, Que.

PERRON, Mr. Rhéal,
Association des enseignants franco-
ontariens,
2331 Urbandale Drive,
Ottawa 8, Ont.

RIEGER, Mr. T. F.,
Executive Assistant,
The Alberta Teachers' Association,
11010 - 142 St.,
Edmonton 50, Alta.

SHEPPY, Mr. J. I.,
Registrar,
Alberta Department of Education,
Administration Buildings,
Edmonton, Alta.

STRUTHERS, Mr. J. C.,
Chief, Teacher Services,
Saskatchewan Department of Education,
Regina, Sask.

SUTTON, Mr. A.,
Chief Evaluation Officer,
Ontario Department of Education,
1 St. Clair Avenue West,
Toronto 195, Ont.

THIBAULT, Mr. Albert,
Director of Certification Service,
Quebec Department of Education,
917 Mgr. Grandin,
Ste. Foye, Québec 10, P.Q.

WELBOURNE, Dr. Arthur J.,
Associate Director, Teacher
Probation and Certification,
Quebec Department of Education,
917 Mgr. Grandin,
Ste. Foye, Québec 10, P.Q.

WICKS, Mr. J. E., Chief,
Teacher Information Section,
Dominion Bureau of Statistics,
No. 5 Temporary Building,
Ottawa 3, Ont.

WIGHT, Mr. N. Ray,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Newfoundland Teachers' Association,
3 Kenmount Road,
St. John's, Nfld.

WILSON, Mr. Harvey R.,
Administrative Co-ordinator,
Qualifications Evaluation Council,
Room 703, 11 Yorkville Ave.,
Toronto 185, Ont.

WITNEY, Mr. Charles, Executive Director,
Canadian School Trustees' Association,
120 Eglinton Avenue East,
Toronto, Ontario.

APPENDIX 3

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MEETING

1. WHEREAS it is commonly accepted that the minimum qualification for teaching in Canada should be a degree or equivalent, with a year of teacher education, it is recommended

   THAT each province recognize, on a reciprocal basis, the certification of persons with degree standing who hold permanent certificates.

2. THAT in the coming year CTF accumulate the information necessary to form the basis for this reciprocity and that the feasibility of translating certain basic qualifications into a Canadian Professional Certificate be studied at a similar conference next year.

3. THAT there be a standard passport-type document, certified by the appropriate authority in the sending province, verifying the following items: date of birth, marriage certificate if appropriate, citizenship, total years of teaching experience, university degrees, and teaching certificates held;

   THAT this document be forwarded at the request of the migrating teacher by the sending authority to the receiving authority;

   THAT the migrating teacher be given a copy of the document.

4. THAT CTF assist the provinces in the development of this more uniform system of teacher information and application.

5. THAT CTF be requested to establish a clearinghouse service for information on teacher certification, salary classification, documentation, procedures, etc., for teachers moving within Canada and that a brochure be prepared for distribution in Canada and abroad, said brochure being updated annually.

6. THAT placement of a teacher be a local school system responsibility, provided that the teacher holds a provincial licence to teach.